

SUPPRESSIVES AND GAES

A lecture given on 2 August 1966

Hubbard, L. R. (1966, 2 August). **Suppressives and GAES**. *Saint Hill Special Briefing Course*, (SHSBC-436). Lecture conducted from East Grinstead, Sussex.

Thank you. Thank you.

Thank you!

What's the date?

Female voice: August the 2nd, AD 16.

Well, Suzie knows it but the rest of you don't seem to know the date.

What's the date?

Audience: 2nd of August 1966.

That's correct! 2 August, A.D. 16.

Now, we have lots of subjects we can always talk about. We have lots of tapes on them. But we obviously never have enough, for some peculiar reason. For some peculiar reason, why, the Tech Sec and the Qual Sec and so forth have trouble with a scarcity of materials on some of these subjects. That's quite obvious, because they keep getting committed or omitted.

Now, there's two types of crime — two types of crime. There's the crimes of commission and the crimes of omission. And in modern society they pay very little attention to the crimes of omission.

The penalty is usually awarded to a person, really, for two reasons: One is for being there and the other is for communicating. Now, that is the normal penalty in this society. If you want to reduce any crime down, why, it was basically composed of those two elements: being there and communicating.

But there are crimes of not being there and not communicating too; the society doesn't pay much attention to these. But the auditor not being there and the auditor not carrying out his communications is a crime of the highest order, because he's now barring the road.

Now, it used to be that people were — you know, they expected me to prove Dianetics and Scientology to them, and you know, sort of carry along the full responsibility for its workability, and when it didn't work it was my fault, and I should have done it better, and so on.

Well, you probably expect changes in Level O, I, II, III, IV and V and all that sort of thing. Now, I got an awful surprise for you, you know: I'm not changing one comma in nothing.

Now, we've gone from a total change, you see, to a total no—change, you see, just to make a proper dichotomy. So, the materials now are just right there.

But today, today, I really speak from considerable strength, because we have such a thing as a Clear and when you clip a Clear on the ear he rings for an hour without stopping. They are that clear. And everything that was predicted up to the level of Clear has more than been made good.

Now, what's very peculiar is the road to Clear, in its stages from wog to Grade IV — pardon me, raw meat to Grade IV (a wog is somebody who isn't even trying) — the total jump there is very fast. That is a very fast jump. And that is one of the troubles of the lower grades and the thing that you as an auditor will have the most trouble with. It happens too quick.

Now, there are some processes which are not in the lineup which would be so quick — well, I don't dare put them in the lineup, you see? The auditor is busy adjusting his meter, you know, and he doesn't notice the guy went Release. So we've omitted those.

And 2—12 is one of them. Marvelous process — the most fascinating process to overrun that anybody ever heard of. I mean, it wraps a person around more telegraph poles in less times. When I got that I said, "This is really it, man." People said, "Well, if that's really it, let's *really* audit it!"

But we have, we have today such a fast route that it's only by additives, goofing it up and particularly the gross GAEs — the GAEs: the gross auditing errors — that can stop somebody from going.

So in actual fact, it becomes a real crime now to audit badly, because you are barring the road for this fellow for eternity. That's quite a long time.

Now, any thetan wants out. Even the SP himself, personally, wants out, only he unfortunately is sure that you are simply trying to put him in. You see, he knows he belongs in. And he is very easily described as somebody who is totally surrounded by Martians, regardless of who you are. You see, he's stuck in an incident which has personnel that have nothing to do with present time. But all that personnel is in present time, and you are that personnel, so that, of course, you have to be held down, because if you got big and strong and powerful, you — being a Martian or being an FBI agent or being something else — would of course do him in. So therefore he commits almost continuous crimes in an effort to hold people down.

Now, there is a tendency on the part of Ethics that every time somebody commits a lot of GAEs, and so forth, to declare them suppressive. Now, I should make it rather clear that a suppressive is a special breed of cat. He is not hard to identify, in actual fact. He is somebody with no case gain.

Well, you say, that's very hard. If somebody does not get better with Dianetics or Scientology auditing, then you immediately say that he is no good. Well, interpret it that way if you like. It's okay with me. I'm impervious to criticism.

But anyway, a suppressive, being a very particular breed of cat, will of course commit nothing but and do nothing but GAEs and cannot be pressed into auditing at all. They won't audit at all.

Now, because somebody makes a few GAEs, that doesn't make them a suppressive. Do you follow? But it does happen to be true that a suppressive would never audit, he would *only* commit GAEs. All you would have to do would be describe to him how to make the gross auditing error so as to keep it from working, and you instantly and immediately would have on your hands nothing but GAEs. Because he then would be able to mask himself by saying, "You see? I am trying my best to audit these people, and they still don't get any better. So therefore I am right and Hubbard is wrong, and the rest of you guys are for the birds." Do you see? "And therefore it doesn't work, and there isn't any way to make them any stronger. (And if we can just get rid of this, then I'm safe.)" That's his whole philosophy: If he can get rid of any method of making anybody stronger or more powerful, then he's got it made. So he of course rewards only down statistics. You see, only a down statistic gets rewarded; never reward an *up* statistic. And goof up or vilify any effort to help anybody. And particularly knife with violence anything calculated to make human beings more powerful or more intelligent.

[SPDL note: This paragraph is missing from the 2001 transcript: Now, the main trouble with Scientology in southern Africa is they're terrified that I may teach it someday to the Africans. So that makes them very, very, very nervous. That's the truth. I've had it said to me several times: "Wouldn't that be awful — to have intelligent Africans!"]

Now, a suppressive automatically and immediately will curve, then, any betterment activity into something evil or bad. If you let him have auditing, he would then use a pattern like the GAEs to audit. You see?

But once more I tell you that not everybody who makes GAEs is suppressive.

Now, a GAE [suppressive] — special breed of cat, no case gain. And I mean no case gain. Now, I would coax registrars into being alert to this, and they'd save us *fantastic* amounts of trouble. Because something on the order of two and a half persons out of every hundred who walk in the streets are screaming, museum—piece, institution—bait suppressives. They're the people who put the people in institutions. People in institutions are really PTS, potential trouble sources, which are, they say, the effect of suppressives. Suppressives are very seldom picked up. They know better than to get obvious.

Now, a suppressive makes no case gain and will sit there and brag about it, and he can't resist bragging about it. And any registrar who had somebody come in and say, "Well, I've had three and a half thousand hours of processing..." or "...one thousand hours of processing ..." or "...every auditor in Seattle, and they haven't had any results on me so far, and I've still got this terrible lumbosis. And I've come here to find out if you could do anything for me. And I want a sort of a guarantee that you can."

At that moment if I were the registrar, knowing my technology, I would say, "You bet! Now, you've had a lot of trouble with auditors. Now, before we sign you up, you had better go and see the Ethics Officer."

Let him trot over to the Ethics Officer. And then an Ethics Officer should be very fully aware of what this is all about. He's not complaining... Anybody has a right to complain about one auditor. But this guy will complain about them all, man.

He has other characteristics which are quite marked, and it's really an interesting breed of cat. If you ever got him auditing, he will only be happy or satisfied if his preclear gets worse. And he's only sad when the pc gets better. And that characteristic was what spotted us suppressives, years and years and years ago.

This is very peculiar. We'd notice here and there — once in a blue moon — we would have somebody exhibiting these characteristics. And the rest of the characteristics was that he himself got no case gain of any kind whatsoever, and he committed nothing but GAEs and could be educated into nothing else but committing errors. And we eventually traced these people as to what they did and how they behaved, and the monitoring fact was no case gain.

Now, there are a bunch of ramifications to this but these do not make a suppressive. The suppressive is in active attack on Scientology. He commits overts twenty—four hours a day. You almost never find out about them. "Every auditor in Seattle has audited me. Yeah, didn't make any case gain. Yeah, they took my money and they did me in." Ah, come off of it. You couldn't have that many Scientologists working on one person without a case gain. It's impossible. No, he would have had *some* gain at *some* time or another.

You know now that that person also privately commits overts — secret overts in the society around him. It isn't usually a nasty habit like strangling babies or something like that, but it could be. Spitting in other people's beer. You know, something.

Just another characteristic — another characteristic is, attacks wrong targets. If the fridge is making a great deal of noise ... To you Americans, *refridge* is English for *icebox*, or— *fridge*. Anyway, if the fridge is making a lot of noise, and it's annoying him, he will go over and kick the lamp. If the car has a flat tire, he will fix the motor.

In addition to that, he will not complete a cycle of action, but if he occasionally does complete a cycle of action and finds out about it, he will then reverse it. You get the idea: He's found out that he accidentally completed a cycle of action (see, he delivered the goods or something): he will immediately reverse it.

Now, those continuous overts, wrong target, noncompletions of cycles of action, are primary manifestations, and when accompanied with no case gain, you pretty well got the boy tagged.

Now, at no time during this lecture have I said that all existing governments on the planet today reward down statistics, choose wrong targets, fail to complete cycles of action or commit continuous overts. I have not said that. And your inference on that subject is your own responsibility!

Well now, if you, in auditing, find yourself up against somebody who can't make any case gain, and you are doing your best, now, don't be a fool as an auditor. You take this thing on an ethics basis. Tech is out, because it isn't working. So your other tool that comes before tech is ethics.

Now, you as an auditor can actually be an Ethics Officer — which I think is quite interesting, but you have to be every now and then — and you should know some of the technology of ethics. It isn't just routing somebody to the Ethics Officer. You yourself, every now and then, are going to find yourself sitting there as a cop. Well, much more superior to a cop — an Ethics Officer.

You're going to have to know how to locate overts, how to locate overts that are so unreal they don't even show on a normal meter. You're going to have to be able to locate all kinds of things, on a meter or in life, concerning your pc.

Now, where you run up against a total blank, you obviously can't get tech in, huh? You see? I mean, no gain, no gain, so therefore your other weapon is ethics. And that comes before tech.

Now, what's the matter with the planet at this particular time is ethics is out. And that is proven by the fact that you are having a hard time getting tech in. With the technology which you know at this particular moment and the results which you are delivering even at lower levels, you have a total monopoly of all mental activities, all religious activities and all social activities on this planet. That is what you are entitled to at this moment. Do you have them? Well, therefore, tech is out. Obvious.

So, the only thing that puts tech out is if ethics is out. The only thing that can get tech in is ethics.

Now, ethics is based on the mechanics of the SP, the suppressive person — the mechanics of the SP. Now, if you were to audit one of these heads of governments who's always choosing wrong targets and not completing cycles of action and committing these little overts — like "brush wars" or something — if you were to put him in the auditing chair, you would find that he would not respond to processing. No matter what you called it, no matter what reason you had to do it, nothing, he wouldn't respond to processing. He's a suppressive!

Now, he isn't going to do what you say as an auditor, because you of course are a Martian like everybody else. You're his favorite bugbear, a representative of, sitting there. You're not trying to help him; you're trying to trick him. You're trying to trick him into letting down his protective mechanisms long enough so that you can stab him in the back! That's his whole opinion of life. And that is what you would find in the driver's seat. That is what you would find.

Now, as long as that sort of bloke is in the driver's seat... Now, nothing in this lecture invites anyone to war, civil commotion or rebellion, assassination or other political activities. But if you were to get ethics in, you would just have to get ethics in. Now, ethics isn't gotten in on a wide police—state basis. It's gotten in on a very narrow basis. It's just a very occasional individual here and there who is in power.

Now, the other part of the ethics picture is called a PTS, who is a potential trouble source. And if you don't think that a potential trouble source doesn't cause trouble, you should look along the line, because the trouble is great, numerous, and so on. Causes much more *apparent* trouble than the SP. So, you very often think that you are looking at an SP who is simply causing trouble to find yourself looking in actual fact at a potential trouble source.

Now, the person is a potential trouble source because he's connected to the SP. He has not handled or disconnected from the SP, and as long as he does not either handle or disconnect, he will continue to be a potential trouble source, no matter *how* thoroughly he explains it otherwise.

Now, a potential trouble source is interesting to us, as far as technology is concerned, in that he roly coasters. Now, a rollercoaster is something they have on Coney Island and other places, and down in Long Beach they used to have one called the Rabbit Eight, and so on. It's these little railways that go up in the sky and have terrific dips, in amusement parks, you see? And the little cars go up and the little cars go down, and that's a rollercoaster. And the pc who goes up and the pc who goes down is *roller-coastering*.

And please don't think he's doing anything else. He hasn't done anything else at all but roly coaster when he comes back in after the session and says, "I felt fine yesterday afternoon, but this morning I have a terrible stomachache." He's roly coastered.

Now, during that period of time when that pc was out of sight, an SP was either directly contacted or restimulated. Now, the person didn't have to see the SP, but only had to see something that reminded him of the SP. SP is a postman; he sees a letter box. That's enough. He goes PTS — potential trouble source — so he roly coasters.

Now, this person is going to *endlessly* cause you, as an auditor, trouble. You're going to get them up three inches in the session and they will fall back four in life. And it is terrible to audit them. We're not being extreme. Actually, we're auditing over the dead body of some SP valence or person. We're auditing across something which is going to kill this fellow if he gets any better!

If, for instance, your pc (who is PTS) were to demonstrate an intelligence graph which went from 90 to 131, there's every possibility that he'd wake up the next morning very dead from arsenic. I mean, you're actually putting his life at risk. That's why you mustn't audit them — not because they're a trouble to you. You're going to kill them. They're going to get sicker and sicker. More and more extraordinary effort is going to be applied to making this person ill. Sad but true.

Now, therefore, you are very interested in this thing called a potential trouble source, because a potential trouble source will give you trouble, will roly coaster, won't get better, and it's a terrible liability to audit them — a liability to yourself personally and a liability to them. If all of a sudden they made a sweeping gain, they're liable to be met with a .45—caliber pistol. I'm not joking.

Now, as fast as auditing is today, it really isn't fast enough to make the total grade against the SP, because there's that better part of a year to Clear.

Now, you could make the lower grades. You got the person for a week. You can make all the lower grades in a week, see? You work real hard and you do a real good job and the person is responding okay, and they're out of a restimulative environment. And that's why you see so many Grade Vs and VI cave in. You're not making it fast enough to keep them away from the suppressive environment.

So they get up to V and they're going to have a long time to go before they're VI, and *whewww*. So you see Vs, collapse. Do you see? They're PTS. And that was because an undetected suppressive is in this person's environment, and the person is moved out of his common environment, and you audited this person, and in the process of auditing this person you got 'em — *whsstt* — Grade IV Release! Great day! Fine!

Oh yes, they're not going to have this much trouble. Yes, during that period of release they might even get wise to their environment. All kinds of things might be okay, but they walk out of that ... And remember this person is only a Release. This person is still very mortal. Terrific shape — better than any activity was ever ... Actually, Grade 0 is better than any activity in the past ever got to. They can still be hit head—on by the truck, and don't think they aren't if they have a real, live SP in their vicinity; boy, that guy gets right into the General Sherman tank and throws all — all fuel on the fire—*bam!*

And so you get more Grade V trouble ... See, Grade IV, they went away, got restimulated. Now you come back; they're all set. Now you've got to rehabilitate them and so forth, and it takes a while to get through Grade V, and you start to run into your trouble if there's an SP in this person's vicinity.

Grade VI, you'll run into more trouble. And possibly anybody who's lagging on the Clearing Course is simply very PTS and so forth. But actually, the Clearing Course, if a person follows procedure and does grit his teeth and try to handle or disconnect his environment, he *can* make it through. I have; I'm making it through right—very nicely.

Well, I'm connected with some SPs known as governments and so on. They have long since made up their minds that we should be shot and pilloried and that sort of thing. I'm just — see, wrong target. I'm just hoping that they will get very mad at somebody else.

But the point I'm making is that it's at about Grade VI which is the make—break point. You could somehow or other start persevering through, if you were a very superior thetan, at about Grade VI. You know, "So there's SPs; so I'm PTS — *rrrr, rrrr, rrrr, rrrr*. I'll make it somehow!" But I don't think it would be possible at Grade V.

Now, the answer to that is what we call an S&D, Search and Discovery. And when you're running an S&D, you're doing an ethics job. And you know assessment isn't auditing, and an S&D is an assessment.

This fellow who says, "He doesn't do assessments well because he has GAEs during assessment, and so forth..." How could you have a GAE during an assessment? It's a gross *auditing* error. You can't have GAEs during assessment, unless you are auditing, which is against the law!

You see, assessing comes much closer to being an ethics action than a technical action because it's finding the suppressive; it's finding the PTS; it's patching up the ARC breaks caused by life and the environment. You see? Actually, those people have impinged on the individual.

So therefore, the auditor had better realize that these techniques — there are some techniques, such as the Search and Discovery (S&D), Search and Discovery for the suppressive, and ARC break — are not auditing actions at all but ethics actions. So therefore, you have to be a bit of an Ethics Officer, don't you?

Well, let's continue it out just a little bit further. And let's let you recognize when you are not getting any case gains while doing your best, and don't keep cutting your throat. Start taking an ethics action.

Now, the ethics action that'd be taken against a potential trouble source or a PTS — somebody connected with a suppressive — the ethics action that can be taken with regard to that person is to do a Search and Discovery. You sometimes will have trouble with your Search and Discovery because you haven't handled the ARC break before you did it. You say the guy looks like he has a suppressive around. Well, suppressives also ARC break people. And you mustn't even do an assessment on an ARC—broken person; you must get the ARC break *first*.

Anybody who looks a little bit sad has had an ARC break for a long time. He's going into the sad effect.

Now, where your auditing will break down in the lower grades is on a rock known as the SP. And what can you do about him? He's got no case gain. He has no potential of case gain. You are sitting there, a Martian. You audit him. He tells you that you have made his finger better. He runs immediately next door and says that you're a gyp and a fraud and ought to be killed! He spreads wild tales about you around the neighborhood. He's perfectly nice to your face, chops you up behind your back. Do you get the idea? That is not a characteristic of an SP. It's because you've tried to help him that has made him mad at you. Other people also talk behind other people's back, because we're not all brave.

But what can *you* do for this fellow? What can you do for this fellow?

Well, now, the only known action — and there is one — that can be taken with an SP is the last Power Process. And that will handle an SP if you can get him to sit still and answer the auditing questions. But you mustn't run it until some other processes have been seen to fail. Do you follow?

Now, where can you get that done? Well, you can get that done in an organization which is qualified to run Power Processing; and where, I trust, they have an auditor who can do it very well; and where, I also trust, they have a registrar who, as soon as the person sits down and says "Everybody in Seattle has audited me, and they've gotten no results at all," will promptly call for the Ethics Officer and chuck the fellow out onto the street.

Well, you say, "That's — hey, wait a minute. You just said — you just said that this Power Process would handle the guy, and you're saying that he really couldn't get in to register." Well, until such time as you run the mental hospitals, throw him out in the street, because he's the maddest hatter of them all. He's the real psycho.

You would actually have to put him in something like a padded cell. You'd say, "Well, you answer the next auditing command and you can have your dinner." Three days later, you give him his dinner. But you're not equipped to handle this guy. But I'm saying that a person who gets no case gain could, in a well—handled HGC, whose auditors know their business on Power Processing, could in actual fact be audited up the line and out and squared around.

Now, when you've audited them on that, remember, you haven't made a Grade V Release. This condition, by the way, is often mistaken — that you audit Grade V processes, but the person hasn't been bridged up to those processes, and when you've audited the Grade V processes, you've got

somebody who is prepared to do a lower—grade release. You haven't got a Grade V Release; you've got somebody who can now be audited to Grade 0.

So therefore, don't be so surprised sometime when you run into somebody who has been audited on Grade V processes and who doesn't seem to be able to talk. Do you see? Do you see that? Power Processes are circular.

But until such time as you've got very legal control of your environment, and until such time as you've got available padded cells and you can handle everything that goes wrong, and so forth, you'd be terribly wise to have a registrar who, the second somebody says "Well, I've been out in California, and I've been audited by everybody in California, and the organization out there charged me eighteen thousand dollars and I got no place, and I've never had any case gains, and that sort of thing," if you had a smart registrar, the smart registrar would instantly say, "Well, you just go over and tell Ethics about it, because I'm very sure they would like to hear all these complaints about these auditors."

And then if you've got a clever Ethics Officer, the Ethics Officer listens to all this and sorts it out, and finds out whether or not this is an actual complaint, if there aren't just one or two auditors that made a goof, or whether this guy really hasn't been — has been audited well and didn't make any case gains. That is what the Ethics Officer has got to decide. And if the Ethics Officer decides that this is an SP, you're taking your life in your hands to put that person into the HGC.

But now, you say, "Well, that's a pretty cruel line to take, and we are very helpful persons."

Well, someday when you haven't anything better to do, go down in the jungle and find a wounded water buffalo who is stuck in a hole, and go over barehandedly to help him out. And if you go through that elementary exercise, you will, I think, understand what I am talking about. Because that's what's going to happen: you're going to get gored.

Now, these people can be broken up pretty quickly. The only mistake they ever make in an HGC is running the preliminary Power Processes. You don't; you just saw right in — *blambo!*

Now, all of this preamble is to give you a taste of what ethics is all about. Ethics is not our effort to make ourselves right and the rest of the world wrong. That is not that activity. It's not our service facsimile. It's how we're getting — it's how we're getting in tech.

Now, we do — organizationally we have a tendency to be snappy and choppy with ethics and do this and that, but the reason for that is, is we're slightly introverted because we're a bit PTS against the environment around us. We cannot depend on the governments or societies in which we exist to have any caliber or quality of justice or anything like that. On the one hand the Ethics Officer is trying to protect the organization from the consequences of SPs and PTSes, and on the other hand is trying also to bring about the justice which we so liberally pay for with income tax and nobody gives us.

There isn't any legal protection out there. If it's a jungle, it's because ethics are out, not because man is bad.

It might interest you how an SP comes about:

He's already got enough overts to deserve more motivators than you can shake a stick at, see? He has done something to dish one and all in. He's been a bad boy.

Now, the reason he got to be a bad boy was by switching valences. He had a bad boy over there, and he then in some peculiar way got into that bad boy's valence. Now, he knows what he is, he's a bad boy. See?

Man is basically good, but he mocks up evil valences and then gets into them. You see, he says "The other fellow is bad. The other fellow is bad. The other fellow is bad," see? And eventually he got this pasted—up other fellow, and one day he becomes the other fellow, see, in a valence shift or a personality — whole complete package of personality — and there he is. And so he's now an evil fellow. He knows how he's supposed to act: he's supposed to act like the other fellow. That's the switcheroo. That's how evil comes into being.

The religionists have been very — having a hard time trying to solve what evil was, and that is what evil is: it's the declaration or postulate that evil can exist. In the absence of postulates and the declaration of such, man is good. Isn't it interesting?

When you take all of the furniture polish off, and all the cast iron and old garbage and so forth out, you find a good person. That's very lucky, because we're making very powerful persons, and it's very fortunate that they're good persons. Quite interesting as a mechanism. It would not be safe to embark upon such an activity as Scientology at all — you'd wreck the whole universe — if that truth wasn't a truth, and it is a truth.

It is the false, mocked—up valence which is the evil valence. Do you follow?

All right. Well, this fellow has been assigning great evilness to another personality or type of personality. And then one day he got into it. And then when he was in this basically evil personality he started doing other people in. And then other people got very tired of him, something of the sort, and he got himself into an incident — after which time never advanced.

Now, this is not the type of incident of which the R6 bank is composed. This is another type of incident. This is a battle incident or some kind of an incident. He is being attacked. He's being actively attacked by other beings, and he is stuck on the track. Now, that portion of the time track, or that point in time, is more real than present time.

Now, every once in a while you will be sliding around in Dianetic auditing and once in a blue moon you will suddenly have the incident .. Well, you [are] all the time running one, with just your interest on it, the incident is more real than the environment in which you are, and so on. But you once in a while will run into an incident which is *far, far, far* more real than any reality you ever experienced! *Thuhh!* There it is, boy!

Now, anybody has got a few of these. He isn't permanently stuck in them. I remember the first time it ever happened to me, there was a line of redcoats, and the guns had never gone off. It was a very light little incident and it went flick and that was the end of that. But just for that instant, that line of redcoats was about the realest line of people I ever saw in my life. There they were, you see, all ready for volley fire with their flintlocks, you know? It was at an action, back — the days, you know, when you tipped your hat and you said, "Your first shot, gentlemen."

And for some reason or other, due to various complications, why, the volley had never arrived. In fact, the flintlock hammers were just about halfway down on the priming pan. You know? There they were. They had to go the rest of that way and the guns had to fire. And it's many, many years ago. And I said, "That's an interesting mechanism," because I just saw it as a mechanism, since it wasn't very affecting to me; I wasn't worried about redcoats.

And I looked afterwards; I looked for it to see if I couldn't find —find it. Many, many, many years later, I found it, man. I found it, man. And it is—you see, anybody has got one or two or three of

these things, you see, when they start in from scratch, you know, before they get up in the Grades. They'll have a point there, and they're flicking around and all of a sudden, why, there is a fighter plane, or there is the ground, you know, or there they are on the edge of the cliff and the arrow hasn't quite arrived. And for just a split instant as you see the thing, boy, that arrow is really real, man! That has made an impression. Well, to that degree time has been stopped, and when you run back into it, you'll find a stopped picture. But remember, you and I are running back into it. Do you get the difference?

The SP never went on from there. He never advanced from that moment! He's there in totally absorbed attention! And these walls, to the SP, are phony and thin. He knows where the real walls are. The real walls are in that instant, and that instant is more real to him than present time with every tick of the clock. And that incident contains something. It contains other personalities, other vengeance. But you, moving around outside of this person — you, moving around outside of this person — are part of the *dramatis personae* of his incident, and you are a threat, because all life is this incident.

There he is, driven against the cliff and being butchered by man — monsters. He's next in the line of captives, and in the trillions which followed, he's always been next in the line of captives. This person is living a nightmare that was once very real. It isn't, as a psychiatrist said, something which didn't exist. (I would never take the opinion of a suppressive person on what the track was all about, anyway.) He's always been the next one to be killed, see?

Maybe the other personnel out there are Roman legionnaires or some past—track Rome. But whatever it is, his bank got stacked—stacked—stacked—stacked—stacked till he no longer had fluidity, he no longer could move on this track, and then he got the business! Well, you could only get the business that solidly if you yourself had enough overts to stretch from here to Halifax and back.

But there he is, and he's never been anyplace else — not from that moment on. You are the Roman legionnaire; you are part of the game.

Now, that is all there is to an SP. There aren't warped brain cells, or numerous other things. There aren't thousands of answers to this. It is that answer.

And you, in practicing Dianetic auditing, run into a mental image picture. All right. Now, a person has a lot of these mental image pictures. Now, don't blame me if a person's mental image pictures, perfectly accurate, go back further than man likes to think he has lived. Don't blame me for it, because anybody you audit in Dianetics will run into just that! You audit them long enough and there they go! Man is an immortal being, and he did not get born in sin at the beginning of this lifetime.

By the way, if you want to argue that, get somebody to run you on some engrams so you fall through and see for yourself! Anyway!

The point is here that this is something that has happened to the fellow; like he's being beat up by a bunch of cops, and there he is, and he has never been out of being beat up by a bunch of cops. He's just stuck in time being beat up by the cops, you see? Now, that makes everyone he runs into a cop — male or female, peculiarly enough. His power of differentiation is zero. Everything equals everything in the incident. And that is the boy. And it makes him choose wrong targets. He can't complete a cycle of action because he's stuck in time. It makes him perform little overts because he's defending himself continuously — defending himself against the police.

Now, this, this is the character — this is the character called an SP, and he isn't anyplace else. Now, of course, with Power Processing, could be blasted loose. And being blasted loose, he is able to function again on the track, and now he will respond to processing. It's as simple as that.

But how can a cop or a Roman legionnaire audit him? Do you get the difference? That's the only problem to be solved in handling an SP. It isn't an auditing problem; it's a problem of the identity of the auditor.

Now, you would just be amazed how many cases resolve in an institution. I know, I've put my collar on backwards many a day and audited psychos in institutions, in many a yesteryear. It's amazing, absolutely amazing. Some of the results I've had with this make me sometimes a little bit ashamed of myself that I don't push in that direction harder. Because institutions contain very few SPs. They're PTSES. The SPs are those in charge!

I've seen a girl actually getting better and had a psychiatrist run up to me absolutely screaming, "You must get the family — you must get the family of this person to — to consent to electric shock!"

"What's the matter?"

"Well, we've got to electric—shock her!"

"What's the matter with the patient?"

"We've got to do it!"

"No, no, no — is the patient getting worse?"

"You don't understand! We'll throw her out of here!"

Talking to a nut — complete nut. Person was getting better, so they had to electric—shock them.

The same person told me that I didn't keep good records. I should keep records that had the time and place connected with every single action as the predominate action, and so forth, and they kept good records.

And I said — it's sort of like shooting at tame dogs to talk to these fellows. I mean, it's cruel. They miss all the obvious things like, you know, "Yes, but what do you learn from your records?" You know? Question like that never occurs to them, see? "What do you learn from your records?"

"Well, what do we learn?" Then complete non sequitur — you know, ding—ding—ding, here comes the wagon — complete non sequitur: "Well, we learned if we didn't electric—shock them, they would get out of here six weeks earlier in each case." Yet he has to electric—shock everybody, see? He even knows it doesn't help anybody. He's gotten that brave, see, he's gotten that blatant.

Now, my only quarrel with psychiatry, in actual sober fact, is that it's not cleaned up its profession. It's got dirty hands. It's not cleaned up its profession, because if it cleaned up its profession, it would be able to view the fact that some of the things they do get results, and 90 percent of the things they do don't. And that the cruelty and brutality which they levy against the insane, or wage against the insane, is not getting results. If they knew about the mind, they would know how to handle their own people.

So my only quarrel with psychiatry is their ethics are out. Do you follow me?

Now, Frieda Fromm—Reichmann — this is not my own opinion. Frieda Fromm—Reichmann wrote a book on it. Someday you want to look it up. It's Frieda Fromm—Reichmann, and she was one of the greatest of great — I think she's still alive — and she wrote a book in which she begged throughout the book for the psychiatrist and his profession to get in his own ethics on his own practitioners. That book is available — Library of Congress and other places. And she is probably the dean of all American psychiatry. She was making a feeble effort to get it in. But that's the trouble.

Now, my only complaint against government is, being bodies charged with the responsibility of getting in law and order, never having isolated what puts lawlessness and disorder into the society, never having made any effort to understand it, but just shoots everybody. So my quarrel with them is their ethics are out.

My only quarrel with politics and political theories and political practices just sum up to the same thing; they do not produce an orderly society. Any system of politics which lets a madman rise to supreme power is an evil system.

Now, you as an auditor are only able to push ethics in or blame SP or PTS for your lack of results if you yourself have clean hands with your GAEs. If you yourself do not commit gross auditing errors, then you are perfectly at liberty to handle ethics. But as long as you yourself have any question, then you will never quite know. And this is the difference between a confident auditor and an unconfident auditor and is the primary difference.

"Is it my auditing or is it the case I'm auditing?" That is the unresolved question. "Is it *my* auditing which is getting no gain, or is it not possible to get gain on this case?"

And that is why I started this lecture by telling you I don't have to make any apologies now. We're taking them all the way to Clear, and there's nothing going to be changed of any kind whatsoever in the lower Grade processing, because the only time we're flumping and flubbing is when ethics go out or technology is not followed. It is omitted or added to. You omit pieces of technology or you add to technology, it will cease to work.

Right now they've got one going; they've got one going now which I'm sure is ended as of this afternoon. They've had one going about below 2.0: "If the tone arm goes below 2.0, then horrible things will happen, because a person who is a low—tone—arm case will never experience any gain except on Power Processing." That is the wildest misinterpretation. I just wish they'd just forget about it. I don't care anything about it anymore. I don't want to hear about it anymore. If the tone arm goes to 1.0 and stays there, I don't want — even want an instructor to say "That is a peculiar and particular and interesting phenomenon." I don't want nobody to do nothing, because apparently this is a very dangerous cat, and it will suddenly run and get all over and scratch everybody up like mad.

You see, in actual fact, this tone arm quite often in processing will go through 7.0. There's 7.0. And you go down there, and you have to come back up over here. Or it goes all the way up through here and comes back on the dial there. And this quite commonly happens in Power Processing. And it'll happen in lower—grade processing too. This guy's bank's going up—up, up—up—up—up—up, up—up—up—up—up—up—up, and all of a sudden you can't go any up—up—up. Well, don't despair, because you'll catch it over here. You see, bring it back over here to below 1.0. And all of a sudden you'll find it's going up—up—up, up—up—up. Cases are circular.

And the actual remark on this is that a *chronic* low-TA case — that is a symptom of rather chronic apathy; he's not a dangerous case; he's simply apathetic. A chronic low tone-arm case, which is somebody who's chronically below 2.0, won't really get over it until he's on Power Processing. And that is the total substance of the remark that started this whole thing.

So, if I had a very low tone arm case, and I wanted to be very kind, I would run the Power Process on him which would bring his tone arm up, and then start him into auditing. You see, if I wanted to be very kind. But if I had any doubts about its success or anything like that, I would just audit him any old way. He's going to get some gains in an apathetic way.

That's an additive. People are trying to get interpretations about below 2.0 — "If the tone arm goes below 2.0 you do this or you do that, or if the tone arm goes below 2.0, you can't get on the Clearing Course or..." You know, it's wild. So a tone arm goes below 2.0; it also goes to 7.0. I've seen an auditor practically faint when he's seen a tone arm... How the hell do you audit anybody at 7.0? You can't get the meter to go through!

Actually, there is a way to do it. You throw your trim knob. You just flip your trim knob, and you'll come back on the dial. Of course, it's a totally inaccurate read, but you can make the meter go through 7.0 without catching it over — up to 6.0 and then over to 1.0 and up. Throw your trim knob, and you'll throw him back on the dial. Then don't forget to compensate your meter before you say the next guy is released.

So there's an additive. There is an additive. I don't know how many people this additive has shot down in flames up to this moment. It's several, several. You know? There are some fat folders around, and so forth. And fortunately it isn't I finding all this, and so forth. It's I that found this below 2.0 thing, but it was [had] already been stated to me by somebody in the Qual Division that — this.

There was a common denominator in those folders: They each one had a below—2.0 trouble. And so I'm getting a shakedown of the relationship of a fat folder to a below—2.0 phenomena, just as a peculiarity that's going on at the moment. That's an additive. That's an additive.

Now, you get an omission, and an omission can be very, very deadly. We cease to have sessions that start and end. You know? We don't start any sessions anymore and we don't end any sessions anymore; we just sit down and start auditing, you know? Pretty wild, because it never completes a cycle of action for the pc and has a tendency to make him obsessively go on. That's how bad an omission could be.

But your little omissions can cause you equal amounts of trouble — your little omissions, you see?

How about the omission of acknowledging? Supposing you never acknowledged anything; you just omitted that totally: You'd destroy the entire technology. Do you see? It could be very serious.

But your problem, to get right back down to it again, is how can you be sure ... You see, it used to be that we had three problems here: Ron could be wrong, you see; and it could be the auditor; and it could be the pc, see? Well, now because of all the Clears, we have to drop the first one out. So therefore, it leaves an auditor with this problem. And I don't give it to you as a light thing; I give it to you as something that's probably worried quite a few of you from time to time: Is it the way you're applying the technology, or is it the pc you are auditing?

And I have seen that auditors — bless them — always err on the side that it's their own auditing. I have tried to reason with an auditor who was trying *desperately* to audit a PTS, who just kept on blaming her own auditing — couldn't even hear the technology of PTS because she was blaming her own auditing so hard. Yet her own auditing wasn't that bad. She was auditing a PTS. And it was very, very hard to convince this auditor that a PTS was the only reason somebody rollercoastered, unless the auditing was very "omitted" or "committed" along various lines. Do you follow? Very hard to convince this person there could be something wrong with the pc, because this person was too fixated on the idea that she really didn't know quite how to audit. Do you see that?

Now, therefore, you've got to be satisfied that you don't commit GAEs, and after that your judgment on an ethics problem will be sound. But until you are able to know completely yourself that your auditing is smooth and your technology is correct, you will not with any certainty be able to spot an ethics problem! Makes sense, huh?

Audience: Yes.

Now, that's the primary bugboo of the auditor. You're trying to help people. Now, is it something wrong with the person you're trying to help, or is something wrong with the way you're helping?

And there's a very easy way to decide this — very, very, very easy way to decide this — and that is to know what are the five GAEs.

Now, we say GAE, and we mean gross auditing error. There it is: a gross auditing error. And there are only 5 of them! You can't commit 105 because there aren't 105. You can only commit 5! That's a good thing, because they can be spotted and isolated. And they are very, very elementary. Anybody could spot them.

You could make a tape of yourself auditing some pc and then listen to the tape back and know whether or not you committed GAEs. It's that elementary. First GAE, particularly, would surrender to that test: auditing cycle out.

Do you give an auditing command, have the pc answer it, and then acknowledge it? Elementary! Do you do that? Or do you give an auditing command, not let the pc answer it and acknowledge? Do you let the pc talk for half an hour before you finally wake up that you should acknowledge? Do you see? Or do you have this smoothly down? Can you do this thing?

Boy, it's an elementary thing there, isn't it? Well, not to do it is a gross auditing error. It's one of the reasons Scientology works, is because of its communication drill. Communication is a basic — so fundamental that when you use the communication cycle of action known in Scientology (man didn't know it) — you can just use a cycle of action and cure things up. It's the most remarkable thing.

You can sit down with the training drills which just handle a cycle of action and with a bunch of people that have just dropped into the org, or something of the sort, and two or three of them will get rid of some somatics and upsets and feel better. What's doing that? It's just the exercise of the drill itself.

So, woven through auditing are all kinds of little side benefits. But this is not a little side benefit. When you omit this one, man, you've had it! So, do you handle your comm cycle well? Or do you give an auditing command, not let it be answered, or make it be answered *exhaustively*, before you finally acknowledge? Or do you hit it on the button? Do you err over or under? Because if you err in not acknowledging, your pc will go into an obsessive outflow.

Wherever I see a pc who's just talking on and on and on and on and on and on and on, the auditor giving no commands — only four commands issued in a two—and—a—half—hour session, see? When I see this I know what's wrong: It's a GAE; the auditing cycle is out. The pc is trying to find that last step. Can't find that last step. And he's gotten so accustomed to this.

Now, some pcs are this way obsessively in life, but you, oddly enough, by a precise auditing cycle, snap them right out of it. A proper auditing command cycle, and so forth, will straighten them right up.

Now, you'll notice people out in the society — you should listen to their auditing cycles just for a gag. Does your auditing cycle sound anything like that? You should listen to a few of them, you know? Lean up against a lamppost with your back to the two that are discussing it all, or sit in the lobby of a hotel for a while. Just listen to those auditing cycles. (They're not auditing cycles; listen to comm cycles.) You'll be *fascinated*, man. You got a treat in store if you've never done this. You say, how could anybody call *that* communication?

Now, that's the first GAE.

Now, the second GAE is the repetitive auditing cycle is out. Now, the repetitive auditing cycle is quite something else than the auditing cycle. It's being able to do it again. And people who aren't able to do it again cannot give a repetitive auditing command on and on. They can't do it. So, they do what we call Q and A; they change. The pc makes a remark so they change the process. Every time the pc gives something offbeat, then the auditor changes the process. Do you see? They Q-and-A.

Here's an example of Q and A — or, well, just the inability to "Do birds fly? Do birds fly? Do birds fly?" and acknowledge it each time and so forth: It's "Do birds fly? Are the jolly little sparrows a— wing? Are birds flopping about? Are birds? Have you ever been an ornithologist? Do you swim?" Where'd he go? See?

The Q and A is simply the shift with the pc. It leaves the pc in control of the session. The auditor starts out, "Do birds fly?"

And the pc says, "Yes. Yes. I had a canary once."

And the auditor says, "Where was that?"

Pc says, "In Des Moines."

And the auditor says, "Were you there when you were a child?"

If you ever listen to this as a gag going on — I mean, it really happens. When you listen to this going on you will begin to detect a note of exasperation in the pc's voice. A bit of asperity will enter at this point. "Well, yes, I lived there, when I was four." Q and A, Q and A, Q and A. Drift.

You ask an auditor — an auditor who does this — you ask this auditor and you say to him, "Now, get the overt," and he comes back with the life story of the fellow's brother. Well, that'll be compounded of Q and A, but also — another one — he just wouldn't do what you said, you see? He wouldn't audit it at all. He didn't even come near it.

Now, the next GAE is just bad meter reading. And you would just be amazed; you would just be amazed. Until you have stood around teaching people to meter read, you'd just be amazed how in that group two or three of them won't even vaguely come near reading that meter.

If you ever want to find out what's wrong with some auditing session sometime, and you've got an HGC auditor and you're D of P or something like that, and you're tearing your hair out about this pc, remember these GAEs, man.

You get suspicious about things, like "How about the meter?" Well, the auditor has been auditing the pc with his meter uncharged. Well, that would be an understandable error. But how about the fellow auditing the pc without the meter turned

on? Could happen. How about the auditor auditing the pc without the cans plugged in? Now, that's what we mean when we say GAE. And you, in trying to examine auditing, will always err in the favor of being too reasonable about the thing.

You argue and argue, and you argue and argue, you talk and talk and talk with this auditor about the pc, and then you'll find out that the auditor doesn't believe in meters and so doesn't use them in his session, or something like this, see? I mean it's *gross*. And that's why we have gross, you see; it's a *gross* error. It's always something *big*, you see?

You're blowing your brains out trying to find this little thing: "Do you have the trim knob set exactly right?" and all that sort of thing. Trim knob set right? Why, the meter has been out of repair for the last two months — hasn't been functioning at all. Auditor rocks the meter to get his reads.

Now, an old, experienced Director of Processing like Mary Sue could tell you some wild ones. She's tried to run down, and tried to run down, and — you know, the mysterious nonrecovery of somebody, you see? And she's finally run it down to something like, well, they never turned on their meter. You know? I mean, it's incredible. Here she's beating her brains out trying to help the pc, you see, but — gross auditing error sitting right there.

Now, the fourth one impinges a bit on the second one. You told him to run one process and he ran something else. It goes worse than that. He is not able to read, understand and follow procedure. That's a simple test. That's a simple test. Can you read and understand an HCOB? See, that is a simple test.

You would just be surprised. When that gets to be a gross auditing error, the person didn't even read the HCOBs related to the processes they were supposed to be auditing. And to our shame it once happened here at Saint Hill. There was no checkouts required for a short period of time, many, many months ago. There were no checkouts required. Nobody in Tech or Qual is there now — not because of that totally. But before they audited the hottest processes in the world, nobody was requiring a checkout on them. Boy, that's a gross auditing error, man.

Now, one of the reasons tech was having a hard time in 1965 in organizations is there apparently wasn't a D of P anywhere in any organization in the world outside of Saint Hill that was requiring star-rated checkouts on the lower Grade processes his auditors were supposed to be running on the pcs. Tsk! Interesting, huh?

Oh, I get on to these things, and I follow them up, and don't think we're all bad. But that accounted for lack of Releases. Of course they weren't making any Releases; they weren't running any of the processes that released anybody. See, that's a gross auditing error, is not being able to read and comprehend what they're supposed to do.

Or, not reading it at all! See how gross this is? You say, "You don't — you just seem to be an awful long time, Mr. Jones, on the subject of making your — that ... that pc — you ... just making that pc a Grade o. This seems to have been on ... this is going on to the third month. Seems to be just a little bit long ... long ... uh ... uh ... So what ... what — what's wrong? What are you doing?"

Well, actually, the way you can find out what he's doing: Is his auditing cycle out? His repetitive auditing cycle out? Is he reading the meter badly?

And what you're liable to find is something like number four: He has never run, to date, any of the processes that make a Grade o Release. He's never run *any* of them. It's that — it's that which you normally find at the bottom of no results in auditing. Or it's an ethics problem.

And the fifth one is unable to handle and keep a pc in session.

Well, you'd say, well that automatically is covered in one, two, three, four. Oh, no, it is not! Who does that? Well, Ron does it, of course; he does everything else! No, that's something that you do; that is up to the auditor.

It is sometimes necessary to be quite forceful; it's sometimes necessary to be quite persuasive; it's sometimes necessary to do most extraordinary things to handle and keep a pc in session.

For instance, you've got somebody who's very blowy. You're trying to pull some overts of one kind or another. This session is going rough, man, and you finally have to back up your back to the door, turn the lock, put the key in your pocket. The guy finally gives you the overts. See?

Now, this pc doesn't seem to be running well, and you just never take out a moment to find out why, or examine the pc, or talk about anything, or have any two-way comm. You see that the pc is disinterested; you don't make it your business to find out "Why is the pc disinterested?" Pc can't seem to answer the question; for the last four hours of auditing, doesn't seem to have had any answer to the auditing question; is sitting in the chair crying. Why, four hours ago, didn't you wonder why this pc was unhappy? Do you see?

Now, that's actually a matter of quick perception. I used to say that it used to take me about an hour — or I could find from forty—five minutes to an hour and a half before the auditors in the org would notice that an ARC break was coming or a blow was going to occur. It was forty—five minutes to an hour and a half. And I used to do this with a squawk box, you know, patrol. We used to listen in on the sessions, and so forth. I could find it on an average of forty—five minutes to an hour and a half before the auditor noticed it. "That pc is going to blow. That pc is ARC broken. That's coming right over the hill." Just from tone of voice.

Well, the auditor in this particular instance had the advantage of sitting across from the pc, having a meter in his hands, actually being able to observe what the pc was doing, do you see, and didn't notice it for another forty—five minutes or an hour and a half, until it became terribly obvious.

So you want to pick up your perception. And that is a place where nearly all auditors fall down a bit. Pick up the perception of what's going on with the pc. Be a little bit interested in what's going on with the pc, and do something about it. And don't do so much that you completely destroy all effects of processing, but do enough to keep the pc in session.

Now, what is in session? Well, he's willing to sit there and answer the auditing question; he's fairly cheerful, and so on. It has some precision definitions, but, crudely, a pc ought to be fairly happy about being audited, even when he is running through sadness. So that would be ability to look at the pc and see what was going on with the pc. That comes under the heading of willingness to confront a pc, doesn't it?

Well, those are the gross auditing errors: auditing cycle out; repetitive auditing cycle out; bad meter reading; not able to read, understand and follow procedures or bulletins or auditing directions; and five, unable to handle and keep a pc in session. And those are the five gross auditing errors.

You can verify, then, your own auditing. And if you look over the whole thing, and you look over the thing and you say to yourself, "Well, I do those things pretty well," now you know whether the pc is or is not an ethics case. Because if you do those things well, and the pc doesn't run well, that pc is an ethics case every time. Do you see?

Now, there's how you disentangle the mystery.

The whole problem of ethics is a universal problem. It is a problem in mental troubles. Ethics would never get in on discipline alone. Never! It would only get worse.

Justice can never occur in the absence of an understanding of the human mind. Never! You get nothing but goofs.

Now, that doesn't necessarily make somebody who is an expert on the human mind, such as a Scientologist, the only person who should have anything to do with justice on the planet. Or does it? But I would not for a moment guide you over into a realm of high specialization in the field of justice, because ethics simply exists to get tech in. Once you've got tech in you no longer need justice.

We are the only road which leaves artificial measures of law and order behind us. And it's only the fact that we are handling aberration itself that makes it necessary for us to be in the zone of ethics now. The amount of ethics action necessary in actual OTs would be practically zero. Big difference.

And we notice that we are not having any trouble with Clears. I noticed earlier that the divisional statistics exactly matched the case state of each Divisional Secretary — how far he had gone, or he or she had gone, toward Clear. Was very interesting.

So therefore, the problem of justice, the problem of ethics, is involved with the problem of human aberration. Unless you've solved the later, the former can never be solved. Not all the gunpowder in the world could blow people into being good, because they're good naturally, and they resent gunpowder.

So, there, also, is how you can solve the problem of whether or not you are a good auditor or not, and why you should solve the problem. And I hope this has been of some assistance to you.

Thank you.