

ARC

A lecture given on 5 August 1958

[Clearsound checked against the old reels. Omissions marked „➤”.]

My apologies for keeping you waiting; these classes are supposed to start on time as you know and I think I'm a minute or two, or something on that order.

Of course, there's no accounting for ACC time. You guys are fooling around with your time tracks to such a degree that no clock around here will do anything at all.

Is there anybody present who has no reality yet on whole track? Well, we'll continue with the lecture, seventeenth lecture - seventeenth lecture, 20th ACC, August 5, 1958.

Now, I've gone in considerably into case analysis and you'll find this is one of the more difficult subjects today. It is that subject that you should know the most about next to all the other subjects you should know the most about.

One of the better aspects of case analysis, however, is that it does break down to very definite items, objects and so on.

Now, a list of these cataloged would assist you mightily, that is for sure.

What has happened to a thetan in seventy-six trillion years?

First and foremost thing that has happened to him is that he has sought to communicate, he has sought to possess something and he has sought to like things and be liked. That is the first thing that has happened to him and all other things are consequent to that.

And we're right back here at July, I think it was the - July 18th, I think, 1950, at 276 Morris Avenue, Elizabeth, New Jersey - ARC: affinity, reality and communication.

We didn't at that time look at ARC as anything that was wrong with somebody. We could tell at once that it was what was right about the person.

But in 1952 - in the fall of 1952 - I gave a series of lectures in Philadelphia; there's sixty-four lectures. There are more in those lectures about thetans and so on than in any other single series. There are some hi-fi masters of those still in existence with a streetcar going by every ten minutes.

And at this time - at this time - I took up rather interestingly, to me, something I didn't know the importance of until later: the CDEI Scale. Now, that's the first time we saw this - the CDEI Scale.

Now, the CDEI Scale was Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit as the spin-in cycle, the dwindling spiral, and I thought this was interesting. I could demonstrate several things consequent to it, but not until this very day had I ever applied it to ARC.

And by applying the Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit dwindling spiral to ARC, you get any Rock - these two things together.

Now, Science of Survival, with its old Tone Scale; Scientology 8-80, with its subzero scale, in combination, demonstrate to us completely what a Rock is.

This will sound very hard at first, and it'll sound like a complete contradiction of everything to you, so - but only if you don't listen.

Don't let me hear any wild pitches coming out of this, because every once in a while somebody will pick up one of these facts and use it as a justification for being an illegitimate child. I must remember this is a polite lecture.

Works like this: it is possible to be in a no-ARC condition upscale without liability. No affinity, no reality, no communication, see? That's a possibility; that's upscale.

It is only when ARC has been entered into with great thoroughness that we get the CDEI Scale going down.

A person did not care particularly what he liked; he did not have to like or not like. He did not have to have reality on, or not have to have reality on. He did not have to communicate; he did not have to not communicate, if you get the idea. None of those things were necessary at all.

And, of course, with ARC we also get the emotional scale and the R, of course, is havingness, and communication is simply communication.

There was no necessity to have communication; there was no necessity to have havingness, do you see? A person didn't have to know anything. He felt no compulsions or inhibitions along this line at all, but once having entered into compulsions and inhibitions along the line, he wound up at the bottom of the scale.

Now it worked like this: he became curious about something, and he made the remaining - he made the remaining postulates necessary; and these remaining postulates which we find in the Axioms - these agreements practically took him out through the bottom.

He became curious about affinity, and he agreed with or made the postulates necessary to achieve this wonderful thing called affinity. Don't you see? Now, affinity, basi-

cally, was a consideration of space, consideration of distance. And you will find the A of the ARC triangle most closely allied with space.

So, don't expect the city slicker to be understood by the country cousin. The country cousin has trust, and the city slicker knows he's out to get anybody. Why? The city slicker doesn't have any space.

The heart of New York is seldom revealed. I know, I lived there for a number of years in a professional capacity, but when you have friends in New York, you have friends. Don't you see? And there's apparently lots of havingness in New York. You see? And therefore there should be lots of affinity, so people get upset about the town just as they get upset about any large city.

With that much havingness you should have lots of affinity. You get the idea? And so you do have friends and that sort of thing, but the space at large isn't there. And - people get trapped in towns like that. You'd be surprised the number of people who go to New York and expect the town to throw its doors wide open; go down to Tin Pan Alley to write the greatest tunes that were ever written and so forth; and they're going to get that novel and that book of poetry published; they're going to get that big job in the advertising agency; they're going to become the greatest showpiece; they're going to become the finest executive; they're going to become the best stockbroker; going to do this and going to do that and wind up selling franks down at 45th and Broadway! New York sort of lives off such people. I was taking a check and a count of noses one time in New York wondering if any native New Yorker ever amounted to anything. I just wondered; I never came to a conclusion. But I did find this, that the heads of most of the major organizations of the town, and the real hot idea men of the advertising agencies, most of the publishers who knew what they were doing, were all from out of town. This is an interesting thing.

Doesn't mean that native New Yorkers can't amount to anything. But it does say that a tremendous number of people are attracted to New York.

Now, all we're interested in is that attraction to, not necessarily the evils of the great city. They're attracted to New York. They say, „*With that much havingness there ought to be lots of affinity and lots of communication,*“ and they find out that the havingness is mostly barriers and that the affinity is „*What can I do for you if you can do something for me?*“ Do you see? And they get quite upset about this sort of thing.

Now, a thetan's curiosity is first piqued by the enormous successes he vaguely hears about. What would it be like to be famous? Or what would it be like to be very competent? What would it be like to be a part of such an organization? You see? And then the next thing he says, „*I'd like to be famous. I would like to be a part of the organization.*“ You know? And then he says, „*I've got to be liked. I've got to be a part of this organization.*“ And, of course, „*I've got to communicate. I've got to be communicated with.*“ And he winds up with „*I dare not be liked. I dare not like anybody. I dare not have. I dare not be had. I dare not communicate and nobody had better communicate with me.*“ That's the CDEI Scale as applied to ARC.

And at about this point somewhere, ARC becomes the greatest curse and liability that a thetan can carry upon his little old beamed back. If he just hadn't become curious about it in the first place! You'll see this in problems, inventing problems. „*If - if he just...*“

Somebody was going around Tucson, Arizona one time saying, „*If - if - if I just never heard of Ron! If I just never heard of him,*“ so forth. It was quite remarkable.

I don't know what's happened to him subsequently. He was always a fellow, though, who was sort of sitting in there, you know - he had to be communicated to, but he mustn't hear anything sort of a thing, you know? And you'd ask him some points on a little quiz paper or something like that under training, and you'd say, „*What is ARC?*“ Well, you'd get an answer, „*The trouble with ARC is...*“ See?

„*Yes, why did you ever go on the other side of the mountain and take a look at that temple? Why? If I only had not ...*“ See? „*If I'd never met her.*“ „*If I'd never listened to him, I wouldn't be sitting here with all these twelve children.*“ This is the sad, gypsy-violin solo of the thetan.

Now don't be surprised, then, when I tell you that all cases can be broken with the application of ARC. And I do mean all cases.

A sufficient understanding of ARC is necessary on the part of the auditor; otherwise, he's liable to pick up something that the person is in good, desired ARC with and run it out. And boy, his pc will be up the spout! He's just lost a prosurvival valence - gone. Gone - gone utterly.

Let's say Mother had stood his friend in all travails. He isn't even complaining about Mother. The auditor says, „*It must be Mother*“ and runs Mother off the case. Don't be surprised if this case caves in. Get the idea? You've taken the wrong ARC terminal.

Now, if you can understand that people really can have friends, (I know this is hard to understand sometimes) that people really can have friends, that people really can like other people, and vice versa, only if you understand that with great thoroughness can you adventure upon this other rather rocky case analysis road.

Boy, somebody who is grooved right in there at 1.1 right now can just pick this up and say, „*I knew it. I knew it.*“ See? Well, he should take a good look at this. He doesn't know what he knows, because it isn't true that ARC is all wrong. Do you understand? It's the solvent for all ills.

I was never so shocked ... I've mentioned this before in a lecture, and I shouldn't have, because it's a sort of thing that you hide; you always try to appear the man of the world and never an innocent, you know? Consequence of lots of ARC - the great shock when I discovered the value of havingness to a girl. The tremendous shock when I discovered that if you had a horrible quarrel, and the girl was going to leave, and everything was all going to bust up, and that was the end of that, and never see you again, and they're going back to Joe or something of the sort. And you came home with a new negligee and gave her a new negligee, and she said, „*Darling*“ And you say, „*What's this all about?*“ It's perhaps several lifetimes full of incidents of this character that made me at last examine havingness. There's certainly something about

it. The things a box of bonbons will do! And I look back at the number of times when I was all upset about something or other, and somebody came home and had very thoughtfully bought me something, and how suddenly I would purr, you know? You know, lie down, be good. Mysterious. Mysterious.

What does a lingerie or a box of bonbons, or a dressing gown, or a new stickpin have to do with human relations? Boy, that's a wild pitch. I said, „*Well, everybody ought to be sincere and they shouldn't respond to havingness.*“ That was an interesting thing to sort of feel, wasn't it, huh? Very fascinating; they shouldn't respond this easily to havingness.

There's nothing at all wrong with ARC. ARC heals all ills.

- If you join the Christian Science Church, if you've got enough money, oh I didn't intend that as a crack, that's a fact.

If you haven't fallen for the idea that you're now above all human likings and ills and human difficulties, and are now far out and beyond and no longer in contact with such things - in other words, an inversion on an inversion on an inversion on an inversion of being awful damn sick - why, ARC is very handy stuff because it's a healer of all ills. And it will always heal all ills - always, to the end of this universe - if this universe outlasts us to any degree at all, which becomes doubtful.

Now, don't be surprised if ARC makes all ills. And I told you yesterday about the cure became the sickness, you know? This is just ARC.

CDEI: Curiosity, Desire, Enforce, Inhibit. And you can take any object on the track of man and it'll run this cycle. You know it'll be a very relatively short time, probably under a century, when guns will be totally, utterly excommunicated, probably. And they'll probably have some new, different type of weapon of some kind or another, you know? But right now, look at the public sitting in front of their TV sets, glued there watching one badman shoot another badman, the name of one of them being „*hero*“ - guns, guns, guns, guns.

Every Hollywood producer for TV or for movies knows better than to put out anything that isn't full, from one end to the other, of guns.

It's a love story all centered around the battle of Atlanta. I don't know how we got there, but that's it. You know? And we have one of the highest moneymakers that was sold here in the last decade or two, Margaret Mitchell's *Gone with the Wind*, and made money all over the place and the movie made money all over the place, so forth. And of all the bloody, shoot'em-up messes, they said that it was Rhett Butler who was the hero, and they said that it was Scarlett O'Hara who was the lady of ill fame - I mean, the heroine of the piece; she was the heroine of the piece, all right. It wasn't at all; the hero of it was a gun. Violence! And this appetite for violence seems to be very peculiar. And we say, „*Well, does anybody like a Western story?*“ I personally doubt it. It's quite different - they have to look at them; they can't help themselves. You get the idea? They don't like it; they don't like violence; violence is something that is compelling.

So Hollywood has adventured upon a very adventurous thing. I was telling the head of one of the larger studios out there one day - we were having an argument, and it was a pleasant argument. I told him he didn't know anything about the movie business and he said I didn't know anything about writing, and so forth. The usual Hollywood yak-yak, you know? And I told him it was possible to analyze stories, so that people would go to the theater and pay their money and sit down and watch the picture so that you would always have a popular story; and that maybe with Dianetics you could analyze a story to a point where it would have audience appeal, and you wouldn't have to continue to put it to the test of box office.

And I pointed out to him that the test of box office, in that it is so old, starting perhaps in 1920 or 21, that it means they only make movies which have proven box office, which means they take the box office of the movies they made last year. But last year they took as their criteria for stories the amount of money arriving in the box office of the former year, but in that year they took as their criteria for stories the amount of money arriving in the box office the year before that. You get the idea? So, we're actually looking at 1921 movies. Ha-ha-ha-ha. That's what I told him. Of course, this is heresy.

- You might as well walk up to the Pope you know, and tell him it doesn't do a doggone bit of good for him to have people kissing that false hand they carry down the street in front of him. Faith heresy.

And this boy - this boy - whole idea concerning entertainment was having some sort of a - this was what the argument boiled down to after a while. He didn't want a story analysis or better entertainment. What he wanted was greater audience compulsion - compulsion to attend, you see - not on the basis of its being a good story, but on the basis that they had to look at it. Then he wasn't interested in entertainment anymore, was he? He was simply interested in some sort of a theta trap, as we would say. And he was, he was very interested in this sort of thing.

And finally, in disgust, why, I said to him - I was actually - you, alone, would have known that I was kidding him, because I was very straight-faced about the thing - I says, „*What you want, then, is something that plays beautiful music out on the street.*” And as people walk up they walk into a set of beams which are very soothing, and the beams guide them into the box office. And they find themselves utterly compelled to put their - I don't know what movies cost, is it a hundred and fifty dollars for a seat now? They complain about nobody attending theaters and insist on charging prices that nobody ever heard of before. Movies used to be a dime and two bits. Now, I think if movies were still a dime and two bits they'd all play to full houses; it's a good cool place to go and have a sleep.

And I described to him then how the audience would then walk in and sit down in a seat and sit there for an exact stated period of time, at which time the ideas on the screen would reflect the thing that they had to leave, and they would be ejected from the place. But it would give them an implantation to tell everybody to walk down that street and go to that picture. All it was was music, beams, an hypnotic trance to tell everybody. You see? And the guy sat there with a totally straight face, you know, and

he sat there and he listened to that - he says, „*Boy*,“ he says, „*maybe there'll be a time when electronics are up to it*.“ This man had no idea of entertainment at all, and yet he runs one of the biggest, most - picture production studios in Hollywood. It's fascinating. No idea of entertainment; it was the box office, the compulsion value and the implant.

Now, Madison Avenue has totally unsold people from the idea that if you make a good product, people buy it. The other thing is that if you put something on the screen of the TV set or the movie screen that says, „*subsonic and - or supersonic*“ or something of the sort, and „*faster than the eye can register, but not faster than the brain can register*.“ They got this out of Dianetics, by the way; we are guilty characters in this. I know, I had a letter of complimentation on it from Madison Avenue about three years ago, four years ago, something to that effect. I tore it up. What will happen now? I didn't think anything would come of it.

They said, „*Then, what you say is that the mind registers whether the mind knows it registers or not*.“ And they went off on this pitch.

So it says, „*Buy Coca-Cola! Buy Coca-Cola! Buy Coca-Cola! Buy Coca-Cola!*“ See? All the time the people think they are looking at something else. And this comes on with a very strong light at stroboscopic speed, but nobody ever sees it. And they claim they rush out and buy Coca-Cola like mad as a result of this.

In other words, don't sell Coca-Cola because people like Coca-Cola, or because Coca-Cola is an honest company and bottles all of its wares with the best water and the best ingredients and so forth; „*Just go off of that kick entirely*,“ Madison Avenue says. Advertise it, advertise it - compel people to buy it. Build in some sort of an hypnotic command that they must buy this product. And every dime's worth of salary on Madison Avenue is now based on this fact. It has a greater workability, they think, but its workability is over a shorter span. It blows up.

When one of those things backfires, boy, does it backfire. People find out they are now making Coca-Cola out of shoe browning, you know, and water.

People who have lost their self-determinism are not reliable citizens; they are not good people when their self-determinism is shot.

Now, the motto of the whole track, then, has been „*short expediency*.“ Do it fast, do it quick, be totally effective and to hell with the future - expediency.

You'll find - every time you hear somebody talking in terms of expediency, „*The reason we do it this way is we haven't any time*,“ look askance. Boy, there's something basically awfully wrong with that person's thinking.

What he is saying is, „*We are not bright enough to come up with the right answer; therefore we have to use an expedient answer*.“ And he says, „*We haven't enough ti- [time]*.“ I'm not talking about the United States Army; I'm talking about all armies everywhere at any time.

„*We haven't time to lay the campaign out properly so we'll just take the Battle of Gettysburg and apply it to the Bulge*,“ or whatever they did at that time, you know? „*And send out all the orders in quintuplicate. And so we lose a lot of people. Well, we can't afford to have any other solu-*

tion to the thing because at any moment something horrible is going to happen, you see. So therefore, so eighteen divisions get wiped out to the man. That's a small price to pay!" Aw! Generals.

I met a general one time. I met one once who was a fairly smart general. He'd been fired. He had an idea of conservation of troops. He said, „*Losing one soldier was too many to lose to win battles,*“ and he'd consistently won battles. It wasn't the army way. Conservation of troops - brand-new idea. Troops are expendable.

Actually, Germany won - two huge losses; they won twice, just beautifully. The only reason they lost those two wars was they just expended all of their troops, that's all. They had the weirdest ideas. They thought that they could kill off all of their soldiers and somehow or other wind up with a victory. Then all you had to do was count population and you had it.

In the Civil War the Southerners believed that gallantry and that sort of thing had something to do with it, but they expended troops; and they kept winning victories and losing the war. Why? Because they would just - you knew who was going to win the war; it was the people who had the best foundries and the people who had the most people. And on a war of attrition, that person who could expend the most troops wins.

Well, I don't think anybody wins that loses the best young men he has. I mean, I don't think a nation could possibly win on this basis.

And yet this short-term thinkingness, this short-term thinkingness is everywhere about us: that we're doing this because it's expedient, not because it's bright. And instead of cultivating self-determinism, expediency demands that we launch ourselves into the crush or into the techniques which smash self-determinism, because self-determinism takes too much time. Do you get how that is? It takes too long to appeal to somebody's reason; it's much easier to appeal to something else. And this is really, probably the - one of the fundamentals back of the dwindling spiral of ARC.

You know, nobody - nobody could run a political office without the affection of his staff - a political office. In other words, he'd have to be backed up, thoroughly, and that's factual. But look what he'd have to do to do that. It would take time, it'd take effort, you know? He'd have to - he'd have to stop around and talk to them once in a while, and he'd have to ask them how they thought things were going; he'd have to ask his staff once in a while whether he was doing all right. Don't you see? It would take time. He'd have to have a personal relationship with people who were close to him, wouldn't he? So, quite ordinarily he says, „*Well, I haven't time to do this; therefore, I am going to simply enforce loyalty, obedience and so forth.*“ And you get all of the rules and regulations which stem - stemming from this that are now the rules and regulations of the army, the navy, the Senate, the House, the executive branch of the government, each one of the departments of the United States Government - all stem from a breakdown of ARC! See? And every time you haven't any ARC, why, force has to be substituted one way or the other, doesn't it? You must substitute force, compulsion, fear, consequence and must always take away self-determinism. Is that correct?

Female voice: Mm-hm.

So, when ARC walks out, then hypnotic trance, duress and punishment walk in. You see this? Now, in the absence of ARC, however, nothing is functional. Boy, and we get one of the greatest conundrums of any organization in this universe - the great conundrum.

If nothing will operate without good ARC, then I should think that the greatest effort would be expended to cultivate ARC. But ARC adds up to understanding; it doesn't add up to force.

You know that an officer in the army can be upbraided by a superior for explaining an order to a private? It's just against the law! I had an admiral's aide standing on my bridge with a packet of orders one day just before sailing; I was talking to the crew. The wind was howling around and I had to talk pretty loud and I didn't have a megaphone or anything. The crew was all up on the foredeck and my voice was reaching on past them, the forward gun, and to the bridge. And this aide was standing up there.

And I was just telling these fellows that we had to go out again even though we didn't have very much, and so forth, and that I didn't think it would be too bad. And I was just telling them what we were going to do. And I asked them to please check over their immediate departments because they probably didn't have more than ten or fifteen minutes to steal from someplace what gear they'd need, you know? And I just told them kind of what we were going to do, and what this was all about, and I'd just received my orders, and they were their orders too, you know? And I dismissed them, and they scattered over the side and they were plugging into the galley, and guys running at a dead run down the dock to rob something off of the commissary, you know? And birds with a calculating look in their eye how they were going to get a few more rounds of ammunition out of somebody, so forth. Busy.

Well, this young jerk whose experience in bringing the admiral tea was his best qualification for his job, looked at me with a big sneer on his face when I came up on the bridge, and he says, „*What are you?*“ And I said, „*Sir?*“

He says, „*What are you doing? Rabble-rousing people? Is you a communist or something?*“ „*For Christ's sakes,*“ he says, „*no wonder we hear bad reports of this ship.*“ You know? Real nasty.

I punished him. I didn't give him a cup of coffee with medical brandy in it, the way I usually did messengers, and set him over to the side.

And it got me to thinking - got me to thinking. You know, at fifteen hundred years ago before you went into battle, if you didn't give a talk to the troops, that they thought the whole thing was for the birds, you know? They didn't know what they were doing. And of course, I hadn't ever read a textbook on how naval officers were supposed to operate or act. See? I didn't know.

I do know how Roman generals and things like that should act; I've had more experience in that line. Rome didn't have much of a navy, so... And in the Phoenician navy - in the Phoenician navy it was quite the opposite - quite weird in the Phoenician navy. Do you know that you had to ask the whole crew if we should sail? „*Should we sail? How do you think the weather is?*“ That's right.

And if they said - if they said, „*No, I don't think the weather is so good,*“ why, and the Captain still said, „*We sail,*“ and anything happened to them or their property, the Captain had to pay for it! Now, that was the way it operated.

As a matter of fact, this is found in the Black Book of the Admiralty, which is the basis of the king's regulations, and it's the old Phoenician navy regulations and textbook. That was a very powerful navy, but it certainly had to consult with the crew.

Now, get this tremendous gap, this tremendous dwindling spiral, see? Before you go into battle or something like that, you always talked to the troops - Roman, you know? Probably by Roman times it was „*Well, you have to!*“ You know, it's regulations; you're supposed to. Senate would frown on it if they had heard you had engaged the enemy without at least talking to your legion. You know? They'd think that was a silly thing. Man was not interested in the action, they would think.

Earlier than that you actually had to consult with the crew to find out whether to sail or not.

Well, this comes down to the fact that the admiral's office thinks very poorly of a person who gives any understanding to a crew about what they're about, and who thinks very poorly of a ship that has fairly good morale. To have good morale is a condemnation. Got this? Now, that expediency goes up to a final peak where - man's walking down the street, he's picked up, he's taken down to a spaceship, he's laid in a bunk, he's strapped down, given an injection. A speaker-phone starts going yap-yap-yap at him, indoctrinates him as a member of the crew, wipes out all former memory, works him over in general and he's now part of the navy. Get the idea? It goes down to total no-determinism.

Now, you just think I'm showing you a few of my engrams. They're not my engrams; they're the engrams of this race, and of all races in all times.

Works like this: Without enough time and with great expediency, self-determinism disappears and becomes not only unpopular but becomes against the law. Self-determinism becomes against the law. Anybody thinking for himself or understanding anything becomes against the law, till you have laws where „*No slave must be permitted to read or write.*“ Well, that law was in existence in 1850 and even a little later, down in the South. „*No slave must be permitted to read and write.*“ We have countries in the world today where huge sections of the population are forbidden to learn! Well, it isn't that this is wrong; it's impossible! If you want everything to go to hell, let that cycle obtain.

And you say, „*What's this got to do with case analysis?*“ That's all you're looking for in - that's all you're looking for is the dwindling spiral of ARC on this case. That's all you're looking for. You're not looking for anything else.

And that dwindling spiral, fortunately for you, the auditor, happens to be contained in a basic-basic Rock, which if undone, unsnarls the dwindling spiral and frees the self-determinism of the individual. You're just lucky - just lucky, that's all. Didn't have to be that way at all, you know? But any speedup of clearing depends on this fact: that the object-havingness - which the individual used to communicate with - communication - had tremendous „A“ connected with it at one time or another which was so

great that dwindling away left a total vacuum of it, and made it possible for all of his misemotions to transpire after that. Now, there is one that on case analysis, you on your own, had certainly better look for.

There's a great danger here - an enormous danger - that you pick up the principal likingness ally and flip it out; and just pull the props from underneath the case so he - practically unauditible. You insist somebody that he likes, or somebody who likes him, therefore, must be his worst enemy.

You see, if ARC is wrong, then any likingness is wrong. Boy! That is wonderful identification. That identification has been in the heads of ruling classes from the beginning of time. „*Watch people who like you because they're the dangerous ones,*“ you know? That sort of thing.

Guy's making cracks to the subject of my - „*Beware of your friends, because you know your enemies are trying to do you in,*“ you know? There's wisecracks of one kind or another. You never suspect your friends, however. „*Deliver me from a well-intentioned friend; I can only take care of my enemies,*“ you know? This sort of thing.

Here's your problem. The basic Rock has several common denominators and these common denominators are apparently in total violation of life! It has ARC connected with it! It isn't something that never talked, never moved, never breathed. That isn't what it is at all. Yet, it's got ARC connected with it.

Now, it's in two phases: that at which it was aimed and that which it is. The target of it is often found on the case and is often auditible.

For instance, somebody has a production machine going of some kind or another which has as its target a factory consumer. Or he has a machine that makes machines that are consumed over here by a machine that consumes machines. Don't you see? Some kind of a silly arrangement like this, but there's always a production unit and a consumption unit or a stopping unit of some kind or another, or a production unit and a consumption unit.

There is always the article with which he is communicating and there's always the recipient of the communication; and either one of them are liable to stop the line. But let me point out something between these two things: you don't want, really, the one that is receiving anything. In other words, you don't want a consumer as your final Rock; you want something that is putting out. Got that? And that's an invariable rule.

If you're running a consumer on somebody you're going to run into something else sooner or later, so you flatten what you have to flatten to get to it. But don't do this too often. You can get away with this for a while.

Don't run only the suppressors on the Rock; don't be a suppressor specializer. Don't run fields very long before you start running what the field was, what the field covers, don't you see? In other words, don't run the cloud, run the contents of the cloud. You see that? Run the primary item which was used for ARC and which has gone through all the dwindling spiral which perhaps a little tiresomely here I've described to you.

Maybe - maybe for trillions of years an individual used this. Maybe the whole universe, he feels now, is built out of it. We get various common denominators to the Rock; one of those common denominators is: don't know - don't know what it is.

Person can get very glib on the subject, by the way. His communication will speed up when you get near the Rock, but he actually doesn't know about it, he hasn't known about it. Don't-know is one of those.

Another is that the individual does seem to perk up a bit, or be more alert, or more puzzled, or more something; you get a change when you move into an actual Rock. You get a shift of attitude, that's for sure. He'll become even more silent or more noisy or more something, but he isn't just the same pc sitting in the chair. Something has changed because you moved in on top of this thing. He's liable to become more defensive or he's liable to become more aggressive, he - you get the idea? There's something changed.

You can just watch a pc and hit the Rock. I am not good enough to hit one absolutely without an E-Meter but, theoretically, it's possible, if you get the idea of the pc shifting his manifestations that he's giving you as a preclear. See? That's just a theoretical indicator.

He doesn't just sit there going on the way he has been going; a little something shifts. He either starts dodging or he starts pushing you off of it, or he begins to disperse, or something of this sort happens. Or he simply sits there more horribly woodenly than ever before. You know, he practically congeals. Something - something occurs here.

Now, you wouldn't suspect, perhaps at first glance, some other common denominators to the thing. One of these is the factory attitude. Factories are born from force. You know, it wasn't just the thetan, he mocked this thing up and he thought that would be a good idea. You get the idea? Your upper-level factories, particularly the inverted ones, are dependent on more basic objects and the engrams associated with them. These things are very forceful; when these disintegrate you get a factory or you get a consumer, don't you see? That's for your upper - upper level.

Now, a thetan can, basically and originally, simply mock up a factory. But the factories you find on a case, when you first find factories on the case, are dependent on objects and the force and violence of these things. Do you understand me? You having any trouble locating anything on a case and you come up with a production or consumption unit, you stick with it until it's flattened down the line. But don't be surprised to find some violence or force on which the thing is sitting, and that is an object of some kind or another. You got it? In other words, they're deriving their force and power - just like an old secondary - they derive their force and power from this item. See that? Now, another common denominator is that after a pc has run it for a while it is quite usual for him to believe that everything is one - everything has one. Comes to mind an attention consumer, or an attention grabber of one kind or another. And person looks around and he says, „*Well, that's an attention consumer, and everything is. Everything there is, is this thing Lump of coal - I imagine everything was a lump of coal for a while. It all had a connotation with coal.*“ You get the idea? Well, now what is that but the no-spaceness of

it. See? It's wiped out space one way or the other, so it is everywhere; it is everything. And this is a sort of an extreme lower-scale idea of affinity. See? It is everything.

Now, that's another common denominator.

Now, an additional common denominator which might interest you a great deal is the fact, consequent to that, that the individual believes that every particle of this universe came about through the disintegration of his basic Rock. Now, I'll go over that again.

They believe that this universe came about - see, it's worse than just believing everything is an attention attractor or something of the sort, see - they believe that when the Rock disintegrated, and all like Rocks disintegrated, you got then the woof and warp of this universe. You got the stuff of which this universe is made. And this universe is made out of the disintegrated Rock.

Now, that's an interesting fact, there. That comes up way along the line someplace.

Now, when curving down toward a Rock, protection or dispersal mechanisms are occasionally encountered that every time you come close to one in case analysis you get a blowout. You get a zizzzth, or a zurruuuh.

You mention this thing, the needle goes spang-urrruhll-off. You mention it again, spang-urrrrul-up. See? Not necessarily up and down on the same case. But, you'll get a remarkable characteristic here that is going along every time you mention this thing. And sometimes, particularly when you're running a lock on the Rock, you see, you're running a little later manifestation, like a consumer or something of this sort, you'll find fantastic needle behaviors which will suddenly cease, if only for a split instant, and then resume themselves.

In other words, the thing is a self-dispersing mechanism; it blows everything away from it or off of it. In other words, it blows the thetan off of it too.

Now, you have to spot one like that on the fly and that's probably about the only one that will really give you any trouble. That one could give you trouble. You run it. Anything that consistently and continually stops the needle no matter how briefly, in the absence of anything else that stops it better, should be run. Got that? And by the way, you could never get into any real trouble running the wrong Rock. You'll probably all be going on a little bit of a supposition that you could get into trouble running the Rock.

Now, the other thing about the Rock is, it is that item most susceptible to ARC breaks. And we have in a nutshell why cases do not advance after an ARC break. The Rock is ARC. Do you understand? It is an object. It is used to communicate, and from which one derives affinity and so on.

It has a big purpose and this - it's an object, you know, it isn't just law - it's an item in the final run.

And this thing, being itself so fundamentally the ARC of the case, is so susceptible to invalidation that you can blow a person right off of it. And where you can't find the Rock, look for the ARC breaks and fix them up - particularly with you, or with other

auditors. Got that? And a lot of you will have lots of trouble in Rock hunting when it's merely an ARC break.

Now, almost with malice aforethought I conducted a little test last night. I had a Rock that behaved beautifully and right at the beginning of session I challenged the pre-clear's first response. I demanded that the English definition of the word that described the Rock be more descriptive. I demanded that the first answer of the pc be not allowed because it really wasn't within the definition. I did it very nicely and after that the Rock disappeared. And I made this test without any idea that I - but what I could come back and patch the thing up, you know? That Rock went. Wouldn't have done me any good to come near that Rock. It was just a constantly rising needle. And I ran three or four brackets after I did that with the needle rising, hoping the Rock would settle back, and it did not settle back in place. In other words, I'd seen the last of the Rock because of an ARC break. You got the idea? I'd seen the last of the Rock - that was it! That Rock was no longer in view.

And I had to go back and clean off the ARC break, first with a big broom and shovel, you know? And then I had to clean it off with a much more delicate broom, and then I got on down to the last little drops of ARC and flipped those off with one of these camel's hair brushes you use to - for camera lenses, you know? When I got that thing clean and slick as a whistle, the Rock came back. I permitted the pre-clear any definition the pre-clear wanted for the Rock; I permitted any auditing command the pc thought was valid. And at once we had the Rock, its manifestation, and as a matter of fact had it a little better than I had ever had it before. And then it ran like a startled gazelle.

In other words, the thing can disappear because of an ARC break, not because it's flat. And some Rocks have

disappeared in that fashion right here. They've just dropped out of sight.

Present time problem, ARC break - those two things lead the van in keeping sessions from occurring. And why? Because the Rock is basically that thing that entered the dwindling spiral of ARC for the case for all the rest of the trillions of years. It's the item that's changed the person's mind from not caring about ARC to caring about it, and that's what you are looking for.

Therefore, a distracted attention is not on the Rock, and therefore ARC breaks obscure the Rock at once. That's why auditing has to be so good and so careful; why ARC breaks have to be patched up at once.

The Rock is the dominant thing in determining the aspect of the pre-clear with regard to ARC.

Don't you ever dare tell me, however, after this, that ARC is bad. It is not. Like anything else, like good chocolate cake, it can be used for a trap. Because chocolate cake is used for a trap, is no reason you should never again eat chocolate cake.

And just because ARC is the basic characteristic of the Rock, and just because the Rock itself totally colors ARC, is no reason ARC is bad.

The basic therapy of any case is ARC; the basic Rock of any case is that thing which entered the person in upon the channel of ARC and then, of course, failed him.

Do you understand?

Thank you.

[End of lecture.]