

PROGRAMMING CASES, PART II

A lecture given on
30 May 1963

Thank you.

Okay. How are you today?

Audience: Fine. Good.

You look slightly less human! Boy, you've got an awful comm lag. Since you've been over here in England, you know, this humor – my jokes have a harder time getting forward. Because you're developing this sense of humor, you know, that's got a comm lag, and you've got to stop that. I mean...

What's the date?

Audience: Thirtieth.

Thirtieth of May.

All right, 30 May AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And I'm going to talk to you today from the viewpoint of treating a GPM as an engram and treating the time track in general and handling cases in general.

Now, I think you'll find it rather interesting, because the data is very fundamental. This is actually a continuation of yesterday's lecture.

First thing that you should know on the subject of cases is a scale which will assist your reality on the reality of cases.* A scale. Now, this scale is not complete. Only the major points of this scale are mentioned. And there are interim points on this scale which are not mentioned. So you realize that you're looking at a scale which is a gradient scale, which has midpoints between the major levels given.

All right. Your lowest level on this scale – the out-the-bottom aspect of the scale – is just total unawareness. That's your bottom.

* [Editor's note: The scale referred to by Ron in this lecture was later issued as part of HCOB 8 June 63, THE TIME TRACK AND ENGRAM RUNNING BY CHAINS, in the Technical Bulletins Volume VII.]

Your next level on this scale is the level of awareness of own evaluations. Now, that's quite an important level. It's a lot more to that level than you would at first look at. This is mental science as it has long existed. People are aware of their own evaluations. In other words, what they perceive is their own evaluation of what they perceive. You got that? And you say that's an awful short look, man. But that psychiatrist walking around with somebody chattering about something or other and he becomes aware of his own evaluation of that person. That's what the psychiatrist becomes aware at, and that's what's held up psychiatric research. He has evaluated that person as crazy. So he is aware of his own evaluation of the person. See, he's aware of the fact this fellow is crazy. Now, that spreads over to such a degree that whenever he examines a patient, the patient is crazy, don't you see?

See, it's an incapability of observation, because it's an observation of one's own evaluation. And you see some of this in sciences. But you see it most flagrantly in the field of arts and aesthetics. And there it is really rampant. And you can say the less that is known of a subject, the more that subject has authority or evaluation as its sole reality or adjudication. See, the less that is known, the more that level, that I've just given you, is practiced. People become aware of their own evaluation and that is it!

This, by the way, is – material is utterly priceless when it comes to talking to somebody about Scientology. It's priceless, because you could break their backs with it. And it – they try to put up a fight on this subject and you're in amongst them so fast it makes your head swim, you see. I mean, it makes their head swim.

You realize that you say to somebody, "Well, we could make you feel better, and Scientology is such – and – so, don't you see."

And they say, "Well, I had an uncle once that didn't think you should ever examine the human mind." That's his opinion of Scientology, don't you see? Or "Anybody who is interested in the mind must have something wrong with them." See, you've heard all these various arguments, you see? Well, realize what you are looking at. Because look at where this level lies.

Now let's go to the next level. This is the next major level on this scale, which is dub-in of dub-in. And that produces a real ball. That level of reality produces a real ball. The guy has dub-in of his own nightmares, you see. Something like this, you know? He dubs in – he dubs in the facsimiles that he got while asleep. See, he dubs in the dub-in, you know. He's got dub-in already, see, but he – well, all he sees is a dub-in of the dub-in. And that is a ball, that one. That is a ball. That's like somebody forming his opinion from newspaper articles. You see how common this is? See, that's already dub-in.

Well, actually that's all – that possibly even could be called dub-in of dub-in of dub-in, because you've got this kind of a condition: The newspaper reporter was talking to somebody who wasn't informed. That's dub-in of dub-in, see? Then, of course, if you had somebody

who dubbed in on everything he observed, his version of the newspaper article would be so fantastic as not to be recognizable. And that would give you a dub-in of dub-in of dub-in.

The person interviewed was dubbing in... You know, like the AMA; an AMA authority speaking, you see? The reporter, he can't duplicate, so he gives some wild, hopped-up version of what this AMA spokesman said. All right, that's dub-in of dub-in.

And then, of course, if you – this becomes ridiculous – this is your substratas of it – if somebody came along and read this article, who also dubbed in – “AMA spokesman says men from Mars must not land.” I mean, that's about the story you would get from the dub-in, dub-in, dub-in, see? And the AMA authority was talking about the fact that doctors must have more money. You see?

Now, try to follow down a line of evidence at this level, this dub-in of dub-in. Just try to follow a line of evidence at this and you get about the wildest thing, you see? You get somebody who hates to eat taking cooking from a bad teacher. Boy, this leads to more “Boston stomachs” than you can count.

All right. We are just now approaching unconsciousness as a thetan manifestation – as a thetan manifestation. The body plus thetan can go lower scale than a thetan. And a thetan's unconsciousness lies just above this dub-in of dub-in. That's a thetan's unconsciousness. See, a body plus thetan can stay conscious longer, apparently, than a thetan, you see, as far as awareness of being a thetan. Do you understand that?

All right. Regardless of the complications involved in that, you'll find somebody goes through a lot of boil – off above this point. And he gets some of the wildest stuff you ever heard of This stuff is pretty wild. He can get everything pretty well combined into God-'elp-us.

Now, our next level up is simply dub-in of the track. We're not too much interested in dub-in of the physical universe around us, but it gives us a test of what this pc or person is doing. But we're interested in it as auditors from the viewpoint of dub-in of the track. There is the facsimile – the facsimile *is there*. You must know this: the facsimile *does exist*. But what the person sees is a dub-in of the facsimile that is there. Sees a second facsimile, you see? Quite intriguing.

And now you get, as the next major point on this particular scale, a nonperception. We know this more generally as the level at black five, we used to speak of it. But it's a level of nonperception. Whether the person is seeing blackness or invisibility or small rockets or something of the sort, it doesn't matter – you know, little specks traveling across in the darkness or something like that. It doesn't matter what this visibility is, as long as it's a nonvisibility. See, what's the field there that expresses this nonvisibility, you see. Well, it's just an absence of time track, however that absence is created.

And then above this level, we get our next major level. We get a spotty, partial – perceptible glimpses of the time track. The person may have only vision on, or may have something else on, or may have something else on, but the rest of it is off, don't you see – and sees two pictures of the engram, but sees no connecting pictures in between those two pictures, and doesn't have any tactile or doesn't have any sonic or something like that. That's your partial perception of the time track – once more has to be mentioned.

And there is visible track. And that is your next-to-the-highest level – visible track. And as you can see, that is a gradient, because you actually got a state of Clear there or, that is – oh, I don't know how many goal Clear – fifty or sixty – goal Clear, something like this. There's no interruptions of the track. Doesn't all go black on him. If it's black – if the period on the track is black, why, the person sees blackness, you see, but otherwise doesn't. Some of the perceptions may shut down occasionally and turn on again, but only shut down when the person isn't paying attention to them. Monitors the time track something like monitoring the physical environment. You're not necessarily aware of all of the noises that – or sights or perceptions or sensations that are taking place in the physical environment, don't you see?

Now, there's one level above that, and that's that there's no track. Now, you can see in looking at this scale that your “no track” becomes a mockery – lower-scale mockery. See, your “no track” becomes a lower-scale mockery there several times. So the first two levels of no track and visible track interchange as harmonics on down the line. So this makes it very easy for somebody casually observing this thing to make some rather horrendous errors in the pc. You can get yourself all tangled up as to exactly where this pc sits on this scale unless you yourself get some practical experience with this scale.

Now, that is the scale and that is a scale of perception of the time track. And these are the different varieties or the different aspects of that perception. One case perceives at one level, another case perceives at another level, another case perceives at another level. And that is what makes cases different. That is what makes cases different, one case to the next, and could to some degree be said what makes one case require longer in auditing than another case. So any estimate of the length of time a case would require in auditing should, in actual honesty, be made off that scale I have just given you.

Now, how would you determine levels on that scale? Now, you probably could work out a very rapid testing mechanism to recognize these various levels by using the physical universe. That's quite interesting. Use the physical universe. You'd have the pc look at a wall with a picture on it and then close his eyes and see a picture of the wall. What's he got? Well, what he's got is actually an upgraded aspect – upgraded – of that scale I just gave you. It's an upgraded aspect of it. It's better than that scale, but not much. See, the error is that the case looks better than it is.

So you tell a pc, “All right, look at that wall. Shut your eyes. Do you see a picture of the wall? What is the picture like?” And he’ll put himself on the scale. And he actually puts himself on the scale about half a tone or a tone higher; because it’s present time, he’s not under duress for other reasons, and closer to PT, they very often are able to handle their track better. Don’t you see? So your estimate after the pc has done this is still taken conservatively.

But within that comment you will find that is pretty reliable. The person says, “What – what wall?” You know? Takes a picture of the wall – “What wall? Well, I don’t have any picture of the wall.” Well, that level tends to be more accurate than the other levels. Because you can spot him right there on invisible track. Just like that, see, with some fair accuracy. But at the same time, be prepared to have that case slip on the actual time track one half to one lower, see? The case does see a picture, and so forth, it’s more likely to be a dub, see.

All right. Now, this is quite amusing, and this is an amusing exercise, because everybody tends to slightly alter the proceedings. Now, this gives everybody the feeling, when they first try this sort of thing, that they’re much worse off than they are. Actually, none of these conditions are terribly serious, until you get down to that evaluation one.

When you get as far south as that, or into the next one, unawareness – and when you get down to those, that’s pretty serious. That’s pretty serious. Because you can’t communicate with the bloke. He’s sitting there wondering whether or not Scientology would meet the approval of his grandmother, and you’re trying to run a case. I mean, a totally silly situation, you see? You’re trying to audit and he’s viewing his own evaluations. And I don’t know if you have ever tried to run a pc who was totally unconscious – I mean totally unconscious: in a coma, lying in a bed someplace or something like that – it’s quite remarkable, but all you can do is – you can do it – but all you can do is establish communication. You eventually can establish communication. But that is your first point.

Now, the establishment of communication at this particular level moves the person up to the next level. They think you are not going to do them well or something. They’re, they’re more impressed with their own evaluation of why you are trying to help them, something like that, you see, than they are in actually being helped. And they’ll move up into dub-in of dub, and they’ll move up into dub-in of track; they’ll move up to invisibility; they will move up from invisibility into sporadic track and so forth. But it all depends on how you handle the case in order to get it moved up.

But let me assure you that the earliest stages there, the lowest levels of that, are not to be adventured upon with a happy smile and a jaunty cock of the hat. That’s not something that you flick your lapels off neatly and say “Well, we’ll knock this off in an afternoon.” Now, knowing this, knowing this, I can save you a few loses based on an overoptimism. You’ll occasionally – you’ll, by and large, in the majority of the cases that you have anything to do with, be dealing with invisibility and sporadic track. That happens to be a very large

number of the cases you'll be dealing with – invisibility and sporadic track. And that's very fortunate.

But you slip downscale there on this case, you know, this case a – you know, and you look at this same case and because you've just had some magnificent wins on somebody who was – well, he couldn't see a thing, and you eventually got his facsimiles on and that sort of thing, and gave you a nice win. And you grab the next fellow and this fellow is saying, “I wonder if I really shouldn't have listened to my – wife about being processed. I've – I've had some misgivings about it. You see, in my early life I had a great deal of religious training, and it has seemed to me, it has seemed to me that tampering with the soul...” Well, base your – base your conclusions accordingly. You're not going to get the same win that you just got on the person you just processed. It's a rocky road from that point up to no track.

Now, I can't give you any fancy mathematical figure that gives you the multiple number of hours – and the figure would not be based on any real data and so would have no great value – but I can give you an educated guess and so on, that it goes by times from sporadic track. If you considered sporadic track one, your auditing time value – and this is just an educated guess – is, you see, twice for the total invisibility. You see that? And I would go so far as to say four for the dub-in of actual track, eight for dub-in of dub-in, sixteen for your evaluation, and thirty-two or thereabouts for your unconsciousness. All those numbers, what? Times as long to get a result.

Multiply thirty-two times – well, let's say it takes you – it's going to take you 150 hours to run out twenty implants – that's, well, that's number one. Let's say it's very clumsy and so forth, that would be terribly slow running and all that, and allows for all sorts of things, and an uneducated pc and I don't know what all, don't you see. But, going to take you 150 hours. Well, how long is it going to take you to handle an unconscious case up through the same thing. Well, that's thirty – two times 150. You see what I mean?

Now of course, what are we talking about? What case *result* are we talking about? That's the other thing that figures into this. Well of course, you're not going to hear me, from here on, talking about anything but OT – the only case result I'm interested in. We've already, we've already got the *fait accompli* on clearing and all that sort of thing and you can let somebody else talk about that, and you can beat the drum for it and you can pat people on the back for it and so forth. And just realize that that is not necessarily a rocky road and not necessarily an unactual road; you've all of a sudden taken off on a new line. And this line is, is we've got that level whipped. And you can talk about it all you want to to people and the public and that sort of thing, but realize that any effort to approach an ultimate in processing leads you straight toward OT and that's where it goes.

You're going to be throwing anvils over your shoulder as a thetan before you're through with this, so why worry about it? Of course, that upgrades the number of hours to

such a result. And I'm looking at about five hundred hours to OT or something like that right about now. That's not an educated guess. But for what case? For what case? It's that case with the sporadic track – about five hundred hours. Because a person would be awful close to OT if they had a totally visible actual track, don't you see?

All right. Now, you've got this gradients of cases. You got that. I don't want to labor this because it's actually not a subject that you can labor very hard because it is based on very crude levels. These levels are quite crude. They're quite factual, but they're very broad. And they have lots of interims, don't you see. So there is the person who only half dubs in, don't you see, a dub-in, you know? And there's a person who sometimes can talk sensibly and the rest of the time talks in terms of his own evaluations, you see. And there's interim areas there. But somebody can have a lot of fun with that as a system of classification because it gives you a classification, and is interesting to you mainly in a crude estimate of the number of hours of what you can do. It's the number of hours that are required to do what you can do, but we have to say to what or to whom. And if all cases look alike to you, you've just been reading too much Thomas Jefferson. Nothing wrong with old Tom, but I'm afraid he didn't know too much about the mind. There's differences and those are the differences.

Now, do you notice that insanity and neurosis play no part whatsoever in that scale of case estimate? Ability to respond to a communication and all of that sort of thing play no part in that. There is no estimate there at all. No part of that. Well, why this sudden skip of what man fondly calls his fondest divisions of case? This fellow is insane and that fellow is neurotic and this other fellow is something else and so forth. And man is marvelous on this subject; he just thinks this is gorgeous. He never had such a time as classifications in these lines. Well, those classifications have no bearing in fact of any kind whatsoever, and are adjudications all from one level of that scale! See? So you have a much broader field of classification the moment that you step outside of observation of own evaluations, the second you stay out of that.

Now mental science, unfortunately, or perhaps necessarily, has been in that particular state for a very long time, and therefore you'll find most of its literature and so on is dreamed up from that particular level and therefore is not factual. So that you get observational tests as being considered totally valid tests. Well, any test that has a human observer connected with it to adjudicate whether somebody passed it or didn't pass it and so forth is bound to be a bad test. Just bound to be.

How many times have you been flunked on TR 1, for instance, in the old days by a coach that couldn't coach? See? Well now, there it was a pass or a flunk by uneducated – not even educated – opinion, don't you see, that has a terrific variability and a terrific invalidity. And that was the reason for these new TRs which you are using. See, it just removes all TRs from coaching from that level of the scale. So therefore, you're free to make further progress than you were before.

Well, one of the things that knocks out insanity and neurosis as a proper evaluation of a state of case on anybody is because these are contained as goals in the Helatrobos Implants. And I think any wisdom that is based on the Helatrobos Implants is sort of headed for the junk heap.

The goals in there are quite alarming. I found a goal on my pc last night, "To get it." It's there! Interesting goal, isn't it? "To get it." Well, what does it – what does it refer to? What does it modify? Sickness? Havingness? Being unlucky? See, it's just one of those port-manteau things. But you don't have to have that type of goal, which is untranslatable or undeterminable. There's goals in that lineup that are quite determinable, such as "To be sick"! It's there. "To die." That's there. "To move," "To escape."

Nearly every one – any one of these implants has at some time or another been the source of the most learned treatises which explain all of man's ills. How many articles and things have you seen on "escapism"? So it's not valid material on which to adjudicate such things. And I'm afraid this whole subject of insanity is just about as valid as a Helatrobos Implant as a source of philosophy.

No, there's something else. There are the mechanics of livingness. And we have had these nailed down for a long time, and I'm rather proud of the fact that they have minimally been influenced by these implants. Here and there I have found an implant where something gave us a bad twist. For instance, there are several incidents in *What To Audit*, or *A History of Man*, that are taken from an implant given about four galaxies over. It starts with a goal, oddly enough, and then doesn't consist of a GPM type thing. They lay you down and show you endless pictures on a motion-picture screen. I just mentioned it the other day. Well actually, these – the actual engrams of these things can be found on the time track. The actual engrams, they do exist. But this was – the implant is what picked them up and restimulated them and kept them all in a bunch, you see. And *What to Audit* was influenced by that implant. But the remainder of our material is remarkably uninfluenced by this.

We have moved toward the Helatrobos Implants because they were trying to find something that would really aberrate somebody, and sooner or later we certainly would collide with the very best – the very, very best authoritarian minds on the whole track on how to do somebody in if we were trying to pick people up out of the mud. Sooner or later we'd cross – we'd do a crossroads with somebody who had been on an opposite tack. And that was what happened there with the Helatrobos Implants. No, that's quite remarkable that we've escaped it to the degree that we have.

Now what, then, determines a person's level on that scale? And that is a point that philosophers could sit down and philosophize over for a very, very long, long time. You could start with the basis of the inequality of thetan power. One thetan has less thetan power than another thetan, see? You could theorize on the subject of "Well, this person's overts are dif-

ferent than that person's overts." You could have various reasons why they wind up at different positions on the scale. I don't necessarily pay much attention to these that I've just mentioned. But there is another one that you might pay attention to, is length of time in the universe. The older a person is in the universe, the further they are down that scale – which gives you some kind of a weird theory about – it obviates the idea or throws aside the idea that the universe was created by a sneeze at the same exact instant, you see, but predicates a cumulative universe that picks up the home universes of thetans at different times on the track. And people in better shape have been less long in the universe than people who are in terrible shape. Then this, of course, could be monitored by the number of overts committed, and the amount of overwhelm and it could be monitored this way and that way. But also could be monitored by a different status of thetan at the time of entrance into the universe. You could figure out a lot of things around this way. But you don't have to go into this line, because you're asking *why*. And we're not interested too much in *why*, because *why* has no bearing on it to solve it. We don't have to have *why* in order to solve it. And it's a good thing. It's just *how* do they get there in those different levels, see? And that's only one short answer. It's contained in one word: Charge.

Now, this is very lucky for you that this can be stated as easily as it can be stated. Very lucky for me, too. It makes a good communication level and so forth. But it's very simple. Charge is a quantitative thing like buckets of water. Let's say we could take all the charge off of a case and run it through an ohm meter and put up its additive. You know, I mean, put up the total amount run off. You know, your house uses – one house uses so much electricity and another house uses a different quantity, but they send you a bill. Well, that's based on the amount of electricity pumped into the joint by the light company. Or what their meter says was pumped in.

Well, you take the eighteen buttons, principally, and you keep pumping charge into a case by these buttons going out. You know, the case suppresses, asserts, protests, invalidates – you know, this is life. And button by button by button, why, this case is getting charge stacked up on him. It's residual charge. If you could... A thetan, however, is not a condenser. If a thetan were a condenser or something like that, you could discharge it with one short circuit. The psychiatrist's fond hope. That, unfortunately, can't be done because charge is built up on a case by intelligence, understanding, or lack of it, and therefore has to be taken off a case the same way.

And you see, if life consisted of matter, energy, space and time, without the additive of *thought*, all this would probably be very easy. You just pull so much mass off a thetan and so much space off a thetan and so much energy off a thetan and so much time off a thetan and you'd stack them all up and lay them over there. It probably all could be done mechanically. But actually, unfortunately, there's this thing called *thought*. And thought is composed of many things, including volition.

And as a result, as the universe pumps the charge in on a thetan, he starts pumping the charge into others and into other things, inhibits himself from doing so, and you get the overts that cause withholds, and you get the charge encysted (c-y-s-t), and the composite picture of the number of things done to the being, held in place by the number of things done by the being as overts – that’s what wraps them up and keeps them on the case, you see – and you get X amount of charge.

Now, you might make it a constant per case, except that it’s growing all the time. It’s a progressive constant. For instance, this year, why, he has “A” number of “spluggits” of charge, and next year, why, he’ll have “A” plus one year’s spluggits of charge, you see. And – this is the way it’ll go – and then he gets into bad company the next year after and decides to join the FDA or do some other criminal action. And he’ll suddenly add onto his case, you see, at an accelerated rate. It isn’t just the amount of time a person lives, you see; it’s also the person has volition. And he could speed this up and he could slow it down. And he does something like – criminal, like joining the FDA or something like that, you know, just completely sells out the human race and there he is. In the course of the next few years, he runs up as much charge as he’s run in the last two lifetimes. So you have that much more charge per case, don’t you see? And then he decides that he doesn’t feel very strong these days, so he’s going to sit the next few out, and he goes out, and – or he decides he’s going to be – do good works or something and maybe he lives for several lifetimes without accumulating much more than just a few little ergs incidental to being in the universe, don’t you see. He isn’t viciously accumulating charge, in other words.

Well, that’s the way it goes. It ebbs and flows. He gets active and charge accumulates more, and he gets inactive and accumulates less, and he runs up a lot of overts you see, and he accumulates charge like mad, and he tries to do some good and maybe even gets rid of a little charge and various things happen. But it’s always plus, always plus, always plus, always plus. And it wouldn’t matter if it took a hundred trillion years to get one more erg plus, it will be plus. See, charge is always additive in the absence of Scientology. Charge is always additive.

That’s the trick of this universe. That’s the only thing that makes it a bad universe. You overcome that, you got it made, see? Then all the work somebody went to to put it here, you see, to be a trap in the first place, ha! You’ve had him, you see! You’ve got the universe and it’s not a trap.

I think it’d be an awfully good joke. I’m in a very good frame of mind to just pull that joke, too. But the universe, basically, doesn’t have to be aberrative, and isn’t – if you just go out and admire it and so forth, you’ll find it’s therapeutic. In other words, you could drift along for quite a while, and do quite all right. But it’s not going to drop charge off of you. It might make you volitionally feel better about the charge that is on you already because you

can also have an attitude toward the charge. It doesn't vary the amount of charge, but you can have an attitude toward it.

Now, in view of the fact that an OT can kick out more "megatrons" than little boy Jack or Khrushki's legions could, this is very funny that charge would bother him till we figure out the basic overt of the thetan. Any overt a thetan commits is also mixed up with the energy a thetan is emitting. So all of his overts have particles connected with the overt. So the only way to really get him is to hit him with particles. See, it's the path of his overts. So naturally, you find these implants are mostly connected with particles. Particle flow of various types.

Now, what's this amount to? In the final analysis, we have a person who has "A" amount of charge – that quantity "A" – and quantity "B" and quantity "C" and another person quantity "D" and another person with quantity – see? We don't care – we don't care so much *why* they got this charge or what is the source of all of this charge. But we do care about the fact that they do have different amounts. And this rule is operative: The more charge a person has, the more difficult it is to release it. That quantitative rule applies. That's a gruesome fact, but that's what gives you your numerical relationship in "How long does it take to process somebody?" And that's why I've showed you there going up progressively on the scale. A person that's unconscious – how much charge? Unless this unconsciousness is caused by some artificial means, such as a pressure on the brain or something like this, which the moment it's relieved will relieve the unconsciousness, you then have a temporary condition, don't you see.

You have to differentiate between a *temporary* condition and a *chronic* condition. Duration of time – how long does a temporary condition have to continue in order to become a chronic condition? Well, ordinarily it's measured within the finite limits of one lifetime – temporary conditions – finite limits in one lifetime. When you exceed the limits of one lifetime, you get a chronic condition, if you figure it that way. So that ten minutes is part of a lifetime, see, and eighty-eight years for a person that ordinarily only lives only seventy, you see, is not part of a lifetime, so that becomes chronic.

And if you get your divisional line between chronic and that – not on man's viewpoint, which only gives you about sixty, seventy years to work with, or something like that, which is just a sneeze in eternity – you start working out on some more practical basis, such as, well, a much more practical basis to work with is a billion years. That's a little long. That's a little long. It's a nice span of time, though. It's a good, good healthy span of time. Half a billion years, well, I don't know. It's pretty hard to complete a cycle in a half a billion years. You can try. And you get it down to a million years, and of course, *heh – heh!* to get anything done in a million years and make it stick – that's really going some, man; you're really on your way; that's tearing the ground up in all directions.

The length of time since the birth of Chr – the alleged birth of Christ is so short – is so short, that before you've gone very long on the road to OT, you could probably remember what you had for breakfast in the year 2, and the – during the third day of the Saturnalia or something like that. Not that you would – probably cause you as much work to remember what you had for breakfast that morning as it does now to remember what you had for breakfast yesterday, see. You probably can't think of what you had for breakfast yesterday right now.

So that is a very finite period of time. That's a very short period of time. A couple of thousand years – nothing. I'd like a couple of thousand years just to sit on a rock and look at the scenery – one of my ambitions. Take off a nice vacation. I consider a nice, quick, short vacation about ten thousand years. I think that would be – that's nice. That would be nice, see. Give you a time to get fully accustomed to the view. Catch your breath, you know. Or catch your beams. Get your beams untangled.

No, finite – finite or temporary conditions do result from a physiological error in the mock – up the person is packing around. See, the guy can't walk because he's got a broken leg, you see? Well, this can carry over to some degree in that he's liable to have a somatic in the next body's leg. But it doesn't carry over into the next lifetime he has a broken leg. So if you just consider a one – lifetime situation, or any fragment of a one – lifetime situation, as temporary, and things which extend over the period of one lifetime as chronic, then we're talking the same language. Not that you have to consider it this way at all, but it's a good language division.

This guy is chronically something or other. Well, you're liable to hear some medico say he's chronically lame. And we get to the next change of case – the next differences of cases: Is this person always going to be a spastic no matter what body he picks up? Or is this person merely a spastic because of the condition of the body he picked up? See? Now, that makes a difference in your processing of that spastic, and enters in to an estimate of the amount of time a person is going to require in processing. Is this spasticity a chronic condition or a temporary condition, by which we mean, is it just going to last this lifetime, or is it going to keep on going with this poor thetan, see?

Now, if it is so built and it is so strong as to be a chronic condition that goes on and on and on and on, lifetime after lifetime after lifetime, don't throw up your hands in horror and say nothing can be done about it, but just realize you're looking at a much greater span of time. A much greater span of time.

Now, how would you find that out? Well, you might put somebody on an E-Meter and say, "Well, were you deaf in your last life?" And it bangs, and you say, "All right, were you deaf in the life before that?" And it bangs. Well, you've all – you've made your estimate of the situation: This is a deaf thetan. Get the difference between that and a body, you see, a

thetan just occupying a body that happens to be deaf. Now, that's – that's all part of adjudications of the amount of time in processing.

It is not necessarily part of that scale, but causes you to make a closer examination of the person with regard to that scale. Because the more – you remember the old Tone Scale had neurological ills and that sort of thing on it and so forth. Well, they were simply to give you a tone level. It wasn't because the neurological ills were of any importance. The individual, who was susceptible to these things over a long period of time, of course, was lower on that scale I've given you. All this thing adds up then about eighteen dozen ways from the middle, and you can make a lot of figure-figure on this thing and you can get yourself a lot of answers. I'm just showing you some various ways of use of the thing.

But charge is what causes the scale basically to be that way. Now, you mustn't always be deluded into believing that because a thetan plus body is in a certain condition that the thetan is necessarily low on that scale. I had a person who was absolutely sure they were psychotic one time, and I made some tests of this particular character, and that person was dead-on. And more – more definitely, that person could hold a position of two objects in space. *Hah – hah*, that person wasn't nuts. That person was simply in disagreement with the family and environment and they thought he was nuts. See? This was actually a very simple case. The person very easily belonged into the classification of a sporadic track; and therefore would have flown.

Going to make – you're going to make mistakes on this until you finally accustom yourself to it because it determines what you do with the person. And therefore, it's an essential part of programming to be able to estimate what you are going to program. And what you're going to program is the person's case. Therefore, you have to have some estimate of the case in order to program the case. And frankly, in going for OT, we have just left aside practically every method of measurement of cases we have for estimates in processing. See, we've just more or less thrown them all away because we've got a different target. Therefore, we have to make a reevaluation of cases. We have to have a new scale for cases.

Now, unless you can do this thing I've just given you here, unless you can, you know, add a case up in there and understand this one way or the other, then how are you going to program this case? Because a case is programmed in relationship to the amount of charge on the case. Now, I gave you some factors yesterday that also influenced programming as to who is going to audit this case and that sort of thing. They also influence programming. But basically, there is "B" units of charge on this case, and programming is simply how we're going to take the charge off the case.

Now, in view of the fact that it requires the cooperation of the thetan we are processing – if it weren't for that, it'd be easy, you see – it requires the cooperation of this being, no matter how faint that Cooperation is, then an estimate of his ability as a case is also pertinent.

But that's contained in the same package of scale I've just given you. Because each one of those levels has certain definite abilities and adjudications. They have very definite abilities, level by level by level and they just rattle off one, two, three, four. If you want to get a job done, don't give it to somebody who's unconscious. In other words, it's a direct relationship.

Now, if you want to find out something, don't send somebody who dubs in dub-in, see? So all of those things have direct relationships to the amount of time the case is going to spend, but that time depends on the programming. And the reason it makes it time is because the programming has to be different case to case, and the longer the period of time going to be spent, the more programming is called for here.

I can give you some very, very fast programs, one way or the other. You will see quite a few of these. I'll give you a sample program. We got a case who dubs in track. We found this out. Track doesn't seem to match up. Now, we can still run charge off of this case. We get big, dial – wide RRs on the Helatrobust Implants even though they're seeing the wrong scene and all this sort of thing. Well, if they can run it, run it. See? But that's sort of running with – well, that's sort of going for a swim in a shark-infested pool with no shark oil, because this case can go to smithereens very easily.

Programming for the case would at least consist of pulling the overts – this lifetime or any stretch of track in which they have any reality. Certainly would consider that. Making *awful* sure that the case had no withholds from the auditor, about this lifetime particularly. Making very, very sure that the case was audited in a pretty muzzled fashion and wasn't driven very hard. Don't ever force that case, man. That case says, "I don't – I don't – I just don't think I can face that next RI. Because all of a sudden, all of a sudden it's grown green whiskers or something. I don't think I can face it." No, I'm afraid that would be a case you would not say, "Say it again." That wouldn't be such a case. You'd just hit the silk, right there. You'd just hit the silk. And you return to an ARC break type process.

You'd run implants if you could get them to rocket read, but only so long as they were run easily. And you would fall back with great speed to patching up and putting together any roughed-up track because of running the implants. You'd always use "Since the last time I audited you...? Get the idea? You'd always use this kind of thing. Make sure that you're not running a session with a withhold on it.

But that's dangerous. And you should realize that running that case that way is dangerous. And that would be a very extreme programming for the case, to actually run implants off this case. Very extreme programming. Now, you could do it; it's the fastest way; it's the quickest way to knock down the case condition and move them up a scale as a case, but it's one of these things, you know, that's right on the edge. Right on the edge.

And you'd also run the case this way: If you got your hands on a goal, you would run all the charge off the goal before you did anything else. And you couldn't run the case back too

far without running them early. You know, you'd never pull such a trick as finding a goal and then trying to find a couple earlier than it. See, you'd never scatter around. You wouldn't drive the case hard to pull all of the charge off of the implant, you'd just be content with one long rocket read and then you would get out of there. Get that type of approach? In other words, this is all kid – glove stuff, see.

All right, let's take this – let's take this case with the sporadic, now. Let's take this case with the sporadic view of the time track. It's pretty accurate, that sort of thing.

Now, you can stack that case up awful hard. You can stack that case up awful tight. You can run – you can run a bank, and then you can move bank – you can move two, three banks forward, and then run back to the bank you've read – you just found, you see? I mean, you run all the RIs back to the bank you've already got clean. Then you could move him six goals forward from where you were. Just overtly, and find the tops of those GPMs, you see; run them through, crash. See, run them right back to the last one that you'd cleaned. You get the idea? In other words, going forward several goals and sweeping back to the clean area. And jumping forward several more goals. You could even go worse than this. You can even leave goals undone. The case is now starting to get pretty uncomfortable, but the case can do it. The case gets ARC breaks, but case can do it, do you understand? Because you're not running any danger. It's almost impossible to run this case into danger. The case could be pushed, hard. Get the idea?

The case that is an invisibility case can't be pushed anywhere near that hard. But still can't really be gotten into severe danger. It's not a – not a case of being able to knock them off and have them spin for a day or something like that. You get the difference of programming?

Now, you get this dub-in case – a safe way to program such a case is *lots* of track cleanup, *lots* of Straightwire, *lots* of pulling missed withholds, *lots* of straightening up track, you see, *lots* of havingness. And then we find and run an implant. Ready to cut and run and hit the silk any time the pc starts going this way, see? Get the difference of case handling?

Of course, doing something like that, look at the amount of time it costs you over and above just sitting there running implants, see.

All right. Dub-in of dub, that level of case – aw! Are you kidding? You let him near an implant? Oh, no, man. They would get so involved and they would spin so fast and they would spin so hard that you'd be hard put to put them back together again. Fortunately, the case isn't very general. No, that case is handled with Straightwire, ARC break processes, and build it up, man, keep going, give the case – never give the case a lose, give it nothing but wins, run it very lightly, very mildly, and run it just at that level where it gets session wins. Gets a win in session, a win in a session, a win in a session, a win in a session. You'll be surprised how tiny some of these wins are. They're wins. And you know that you're doing it too steep when they don't get a session win. That's too steep, and you drop right back down scale.

This is true of all cases, but particularly that case. No, it's not true of a person who has sporadically visible, correct track. He can have half a dozen sessions with no damn win at all, and you've gotten charge off all the way and he comes out of it. See, and he's had wins, see? But this case – you don't depend on that case that I just mentioned saying he has had wins. You couldn't care less whether he says he has wins or not. But this case – unless this case recognizes wins, this case's reality is not coming up.

Now, let's go a little bit further downscale and let's take the person who has own evaluations of own evaluations, and boy, you're sure getting toward a case that can only stand havingness. That's how extreme this is getting at this point. It's getting awfully extreme. So you're looking at CCHs. You're looking – you're looking at various types of room-contact, present-time-contact processes. So some fellow says, "Well, I don't know. I've often thought you Scientologists might possibly have something, because I had a patient once who thought that you possibly might have something." What you going to do? Well, of course, if he has certain professional connections it might be a great temptation to say, you know, "All right, let's pick up 'die,' and 'nix die,' and *oh – heh – heh!*" and fire away. It might be a great temptation. But if you're going to help this case out, man, you're not going to run him anywhere near track. Because he doesn't know – he doesn't know what he's had for breakfast. He cannot differentiate an overt. His level of responsibility is incapable of detecting an overt. This kind of a case, by the way, can go down and rob a shop and then tell you all about it in session, but it never comes off as an overt. You've seen this type of response to Security Checking.

Well, there's where that case stands with relationship to implants. That's CCHs, and your *risk* is Straightwire. Now we're – we're really going to take a big risk with this case, see? We're going to run some Straightwire. Get the – get the different view.

And the case that's unconscious, of course, merely establish communication. If you can eventually establish communication, well, "Touch that pillow. Touch the bed," and move their hand accordingly – any type of communication or reach that you can establish that way (it's a sort of a downgraded CCH), you'll get to such a case.

Animal processing and so forth doesn't necessarily follow this, but again – follow on that scale – but it's again a question of establishing communication. And if you can get the animal to reach, why, he'll come up the line. I told you one time I gave up on a cat, just out of pure laziness and so forth, but I never did get the cat up to talking. I didn't spend many hours on the cat, but the cat got awful bright. A very brilliant cat after a while. There was no time in processing. Now, if I'd set – if I'd programmed that the way you should, why, the cat would come way up the line.

Now, I don't know how you'd process a beetle; at the moment I really don't know. Because his reality would be if you were going to squash him or that you're some kind of a giant or something. He wouldn't have any kind of a reality at all on the situation.

But there's cases. And there's how they – there is the data on which you program. That's how to establish the data from which you program. And in using the scale, in using the scale, use it adventurously. Always establish somebody's level on the scale optimistically, and fall back if you have to. Always be a little optimistic.

Now, there are lots of tests for this kind of thing. I'm sure a lot of tests will be developed along this basic line by which you can establish this much more easily. And probably these tests can be coordinated against the old OCAs and that sort of thing – against the behavior and the security. The old auditor's reports should be able to – you know, you've got the person's OCA, and you've got the auditor's report that had that OCA, and if we had enough time and so forth, we could undoubtedly get an OCA coordinated against this, but that will probably happen too.

Now, the programming, then, is “How much charge?” And the reason for programming is to get as much charge off as can be gotten off with the pc winning. You get as much charge off as you can get off with the pc winning. And it's all a quantitative proposition, and you see this charge – you see charge coming off a case with the old meter. Every time that needle goes on a big downsurge or throws off a cracking big rocket read, or something of that sort, and every time you get – particularly, you get a blowdown of your TA – that's a big one; that's big stuff, you see – that's charge off the case. That's charge off the case.

Now, in view of the fact that all the charge isn't in restimulation at the same time, fortunately, you see this charge come off one rocket read and so forth and one blowdown at a time, but it's all adding up. Even though the TA tends to remain high on the case, you're still blowing charge off of the case, you see? And gradually, as you go along, if you added up the amount of charge for each RR and the relative number of dials of charge that went off for every blowdown – you got the idea – how many – how far do you have to put this tone arm down, and that actually is so many ohms; a rocket read is a registration of so many ohms of release of charge. If you went to all of this trouble, you actually would come up with a mathematical figure. See? And you could say, “We have taken...” At the end of two or three intensives, we could say, “We have removed five volts,” see, or something like that, “from the pc.”

But it's that precise, and that's what we mean by charge. Every time you see that thing blow down, that's just that many more microamps that have been registered and no longer apply.

Now, why is charge important? Why is it important? Well, that's answered very, very briefly. It's important because it's what restimulates when he tries to outflow and therefore prevents his outflow. So you see, charge on the case does not, then, give him something that

he can release in a sudden zap, or something like that. That isn't it. The charge that he has to release that way is actually created by him at the moment of release. That's the creation of charge. It has nothing to do with residual charge. But if he *tries* to put out any kind of an out-flow or *tries* to reach out, he's reaching out through this charge, and the charge reactivates because of his reach, and knocks his ruddy head off. Charge is what educates him not to reach.

Now, it has numerous reactions upon the thetan such as somatics, pain, pressure and all that sort of thing, but these things do not exist in the absence of charge. When the charge is gone, these things do not then activate. So a person can reach and he can do.

Processing, then, becomes a rather simple subject, if you look at it, there's just so much charge on this case, and you've got to release that charge. And we know the identity of some of the things the case has that does have a maximum charge on it, regardless of the significance. And then we're going to release that much charge off the case. That case, then, will get that much better. I mean, it's just a one-two-three-four proposition like that. Nothing very esoteric, so that "If we can teach this case to think pure thoughts, then at the end of that time he will be able to sit and regard his navel and bother nobody." See, we're not – we're not after that particular target.

We have found that if a person cannot reach, cannot communicate and cannot be active on their own self-determinism, that that person is ill, and more than that, is quite a menace to himself. And he does himself in; all kinds of things are going on that he has no control over; things look pretty awful.

Now, if you were to measure self-determinism on the scale I have given you, of course, total self-determinism is only present in the highest level I gave you. That's the only place total self-determinism is present. Because if a person were totally self-determined, he wouldn't have any automaticities and therefore he'd have no time track. So therefore, there'd be no charge on the case, so you have unlimited reach. And that's what we's heading fo' these days. So brethren, get off dat charge!

Thank you.