ARC BREAKS AND
THE COMM CYCLE

A lecture given on
24 July 1963

Thank you.

Well, you're going to get some demonstrations before we're much older. And I'm grooving in Model Session a little bit better. Couple little bugs these days in Model Session.

"Do you agree that's clean?" can cause an ARC break. What you want to communicate to the pc is that did the pc have anything to say about it? You, after all, have asked a question, and you inform him of the state of the needle and ask him if he's got anything he wants to say about it. But I haven't quite got the pat wording for that. But it's interesting that the two, three little changes that – they're just little refinements make it easier on the auditor.

We're using mostly the 3N Model Session and in actual fact have not used the old, original, long-drawn-out beginning ruds-end ruds Model Session for some time. And it's a good training ground, maybe, but in actual fact, the since mid ruds are enormously better. Since mid ruds and pull missed withholds are enormously better than any beginning rudiments we ever had. And an ARC break assessment at the end of session, just whether there's been an ARC break or not, is enormously superior to any end rudiments we ever had. Don't you see? So you just clean every line of it. You don't do an assessment by elimination. Just, if you got a tick, find out what it is. And just clean that up, and your pc comes up shining.

So it actually makes Model Session pretty easy to do, but it's still a very precise activity. We've now got the body of the session, we end the body of the session, you know? Goals and gains, all that sort of thing. Everything is there – you know, we adjust the pc's chair and ask if it's all right to audit in the room and get a can squeeze and put in the R-factor and start the session, you know? Same thing. Get the goals and roll right on through. Get the pc's goals, and [if] pc's needle's a bit agitated, your tone arm is higher than it was the last session, we put in our since mid ruds and see if there's any missed withholds, and carry right on through to the – into the body of the session, and do whatever we've got to do. Come right on up to the end of the body of the session and chatter with him a little bit before we tell him that's the end of the body of the session – that's very informal but still there. Then we get the pc's – ARC break assessment – usually omitted, if the session's quite happy and the pc has had a big win in the session; we certainly don't harass him with an ARC break assessment.

And then we take our goals, and we take up each goal. I notice some not quite doing that, maybe. And actually, those are written on the auditor's report, diagonally across the goal. See, we just write "yes," you know, or "maybe," see, across each goal. We don't write down another section here that says whether or not he made his goals, see? "To have a good session": Well, we give him that goal, you know – did he make it? He says yes, we write "yes" diagonally across that top there, see? So we can see what his goals and gains were just by looking at that one block. And it's easy to review, see?

When he's got all that, we don't keep pestering him; we just read it to him, did he make them or didn't he make them? Then we thank him for making his goals in this session, or if he only made part of them, why, "Thank you for making some of your goals in this session; I'm sorry you didn't make all of them." Then we ask him for his gains, and we take down the gains. And we don't keep bleeding gains. We don't keep asking the question "Did you make any gains for the session?" We just take what he's got, see? We make sure that he's answered it to his satisfaction – and remember he's pretty foggy, so sometimes that's a little difficult to get closed out. You're still trying to end the session, he's still trying to give you gains, you know? Long time to answer the question or something like that. Well, let him answer it to his satisfaction, but don't you keep pounding with the question about gains for the session. You understand? You can over-ask him, see? And next thing you know, he's giving imaginary gains that he never heard of.

When he's got those you say, "Thank you for making these gains in this session," or, "Thank you for making some gains in this session; I'm sorry you didn't make all of them." And – "Sorry you didn't make more gains," rather – and close that out.

And then we just get a can squeeze test, run any Havingness that we have to run if the can squeeze test was less than the beginning of the session, and simply ask him, "Is there anything you want to say before we end the session?" Let him say it. Then we say, "Is it all right with you if I end the session now?" and get a yes on that and we just end the session. That's it. And "Tell me I'm no longer auditing you."

All of these various lines we've had before – those little courtesy lines are in there. The only additional ones: thanking him for his goals, then thanking him for his gains. And that is the form of a Model Session these days. But it still requires a precision, don't you see? It is still a Model Session and its wording is very fixed for each one of these points.

Before I gave you a demonstration of this Model Session brought up-to-date, however, I wanted to get that business of what do you say to a pc? What is exactly the best thing to say, you know? "That didn't read." "Do you agree that that is clean?" – that type of approach can cause ARC breaks.

I myself have felt like saying, "Well, I don't have to agree that it's clean. To hell with it!" you know? "What are you trying to do, force me to say there are no more answers on this

question, 'In the last trillion trillion years is there anything you have suppressed?' Hell, I know it can't be clean. It's clean for the purposes of the session, maybe, but sure isn't clean! " That's why, when you heard a demonstration I was giving on that tape a short time ago, I was slipping that. You saw I wasn't using it very much, and fumbling around with it. I was still trying to find a proper wording. Soon as I get that taped, why, I'll give you this new one. It's almost exactly the same one that you're.using now; I'm just giving you these little refinements. All refinements these days are just in the direction of causing less ARC breaks and getting more auditing done.

The reason you have rough needles, however, has nothing to do with your Model Session or your rudiments or anything else. The reason you have rough needles is you miss on TR 2 or TR 4. You miss TR 2 and TR 4 and you got a rough needle. That's it – bang. Just like that. Comes back to auditing cycle.

If an auditor's pc has a clean needle consistently, you know that this pc is either phenomenal or this auditor has very, very good TR 2 and TR 4 – very good TR 2 and TR 4, see? And if pc has a rough needle, not all the rudiments in the world will put it together if the auditor's TR 2 and TR 4 are for the birds. See? That's a big point. That's a big point.

Now, I invite you sometime to just watch this. Any auditor will have this happen to him. It happens about once a session. Sometime in the session you got a clean needle, it's flowing along here very neatly and very nicely and smoothly-clean needle, everything going fine – and all of a sudden you got a dirty needle. You immediately assume pc has a missed withhold. If you were to take a tape of your auditing session, you would find out very rapidly that your TR 2 went out or the pc originated and you did something about it. Something happened there between TR 2 and TR 4, and immediately your needle was rough.

Be very revelatory to you if you had a tape of the needle – we're trying to accomplish this technically, a very hard problem – if you had a tape of your needle in your session and you could play it back sometime, you'd learn a lot. And it's quite intriguing. And you say, "What the hell gets into me?" you know?

Pc said, "I had an ache."

"Oh yes, where was it? Oh yeah, hm-mm? Have anything to do with the process we were running?" Dirty needle. Just like that. Bang-bang!

"Uh, well, I feel better now."

"Well, you don't have to worry about that. We'll get you into another…

But you watch the coordination between auditing cycle and dirty and clean needles, and you're going to be fascinated! And whenever you look around and you see an awful lot of pcs have dirty needles, you look around, you'll see an awful lot of auditors have dirty TR 2 and

TR 4. You clean up the TR 2 and TR 4 and you'll clean up more needles than you can shake a stick at. It isn't the significance of it, you see; it's the calm flow of the auditing cycle.

Well, I didn't come in here to give you a lecture on this today. I'm going to give you a lecture on the subject of ARC breaks, so I might as well start this lecture.

This is what?

Audience: July 24th.

Twenty-four July, AD 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And here is a lecture on the subject of ARC break assessments – one which you need. You need. You need this worse than you think. ARC break assessments.

Now, I've just been rattling along here and talking about sessioning in general, which is of course a very applicable part of this lecture. But YOU normally consider a dirty needle, you see, as a withhold or something that the pc has done. And you seldom look at it as something that the auditor has done.

Well, let me point out to you that there are two communication cycles in an auditing cycle – two communication cycles in an auditing cycle – and either one of those two communication cycles can be active.

Now, number one is auditor to pc. Number two is pc to auditor. Now, either of those can operate independently. And one of those cycles goes this way: "Do fish swim?" see, and the pc hears it and understands it, see? And that is simply cause, distance, effect. So that's a communication cycle, see? Cause, distance, effect.

Now, pc says, "Yes," and auditor hears it and understands it. Now, that's cause, distance, effect.

Now, you're used to all this, of course, but you probably haven't looked at it in the degree of separateness which it deserves, since either one of them can exist independent of the other one, and both of those communication cycles have to be perfect or very acceptable before you have an auditing cycle. An auditing cycle is not made up, then, of auditor command, pc's reply, auditor's acknowledgment, see? That is a very, very loose look at an auditing cycle.

An auditing cycle can exist, frankly, on either of these independently. The pc doesn't have to say a thing and yet be perfectly satisfied. Do you see – a communication can exist from the auditor to the pc.

What's your R-factor? That's a communication from the auditor to the pc, isn't it? Pc understands it. You ever hear a pc say very much to an R-factor? He doesn't even have to signify he's heard it. There's nothing in the books that says lie did. But he has to understand it. He doesn't have to say anything. "Okay, all right. Well, I agree that is the R-factor" – you don't expect the pc to say that, see?

Similarly, you're going along in an auditing session, the pc suddenly says, "Hey! I just realized that dirigibles aren't airplanes, see? You know, it's a fact!" And you haven't even been auditing dirigibles or airplanes or anything else. This very often takes you by surprise. It can be close or far from the subject of the auditing session – that has nothing to do with it – but it's an independent communication cycle. An independent communication cycle.

Now, you're so cheerful on the subject of getting your TR 2 in, just right, in answer to the TR 4 that you don't sometimes look at the fact that TR 4 doesn't depend on TR 2, not even vaguely. That's why it's TR 4. It's up – up numbered. What is this?

Do you know that some of the most successful origin handling I've ever done had no acknowledgment connected with them. Although you can say the auditor is supposed to understand and acknowledge the thing – receive, understand and acknowledge the communication, all that sort of thing – you can go into that kind of thing and try to explain what this is; in actual fact, look at this in its most naked form. This is just simply a single communication cycle, originated by the pc and received and understood by the auditor. And if you look at that, not with any tricks or gimmicks around it, all will suddenly make sense. Just as the auditor is emanating and originating his auditing cycle as a one-way communication in its first step, and just as an auditor can originate things which the pc doesn't have to respond to at all, so can you get the reverse thing going in a session – which is to say, the pc says something. And that's a communication cycle. And the only thing you're trying to do is signific that it exists. You're not trying to do TR 2 or anything else. I mean, the pc originates: he says, "Dirigibles are not airplanes." He's had a cognition of some kind or another. One of the ways to knock him off his base is to give him a very artificial TR 2. Did you ever have an origin knocked off its base by having the auditor say "Very good. Thank you?" – get a very artificial piece of stuff back in your teeth. You've just said something that was important to you.

Very often in auditing I'll handle an origin with a facial expression or a head nod, because it's a one-way cycle. And only a ghost of the thing the other way needs go, and actually needn't really go at all. If you're really good at projecting your think tank, you could sit there with the face of a wooden Indian and do a perfect TR 4.

1 know that sounds utterly incredible. The way not to handle a TR 4 is to make it obvious that you haven't understood and that you have received the communication. "Thank you."

"I suddenly – I suddenly realize," the pc says, "I suddenly realize – I suddenly realize my migraine headache's gone! I had it for years! Gone! Hey, what do you know! Ha! It's gone! Gone!"

"Thank you."

What the auditor has done in that particular regard is make a mistake of thinking a pc runs a reverse auditing cycle. See, he thinks the pc is now going to audit him. The point here is you audit any little kid on "Touch that table" or "Touch that chair" for a little while, and nearly all of them will suddenly start giving the command to you. They get their flow going so far, and you're a fool if you don't do them, too. And you touch the table and touch the chair, and the kid's all satisfied and so forth. And they're perfectly willing for your next command, see? It's quite a game they play. They go into a very complete duplication of the auditing session. A good auditor of children and so on is quite well aware of this and doesn't refuse to execute the auditing command. It throws a kid completely out of session. Kid is overwhelmed. That's the kid's effort to be right, don't you see?

All right. But in handling an origin, the pc has not started to audit the auditor. That's a different kettle of fish. The pc doesn't expect anything but a comprehension. That's all the pc expects.

Now, how do you signify a comprehension? Well, I know your telepather is kind of busted; it's been busted for quite a while. I know mine has been, to the degree that it might be. I sometimes look back at what telepathy once was, and a guy is two thousand yards away and you hear all of his thoughts with a crash, don't you see? That's OT stuff. You can also have obsessive telepathy where you hear everybody all the time. This is sort of out of control. But we're not asking for anything that is that marvelous. We're asking for pure and simple, an ordinary response to a communication.

Now, how do you signify that you comprehended? Until you can answer that question well – till you can answer that question well and pleasantly… to yourself, see – I mean, not pleasantly but satisfactorily.

Well, you're sitting there right now. How are you "comprehending" to me that you heard what I said and understand it? Yeah, I look at your faces and you're all doing it beautifully. See? Perfect.

Now, that is an origin; handling of And that's all there is to handling an origin. Pc says something and you understand it. Now, we say "and acknowledge it," but we've gone too far because we're tending to put it in a thing. We let the pc know we've understood it. For instance, once in a while I'll just laugh like hell, see, you know? Pc has said something that's very funny to the pc, you know, and seems funny to me (I won't laugh if I don't think it's funny to me; I won't corn up the emotions on it), and I'll just laugh, you know. I'll say… Pc's perfectly satisfied. That's because there's no auditing cycle involved. That's just a communication cycle. That's all there is to it, see?

Now, there are a bunch of processes which require no answer from the pc but do require a response from the pc of some kind or another. But they are Concept Processes – the old Concept Processes: "Get the idea of Well, the pc can sit there and get the idea and never

really say "Yes, I No nothing to the auditor. You know he's done it. Well, how did you know he s done it? Oh, you look at his breathing and that sort of thing, you take a look at him and so on.

You get into this trouble in R3R. How do you know the pc has moved to the beginning of the incident? See, that's an interesting little hole. Because you didn't say "Move to the beginning of the incident at approximately… and tell me when you get there."

In the first place, that would be very sour, because it's two auditing commands, they're already complicated, he's in too much trouble already; and once in a while, any auditor will get dopey and have moved the pc to the beginning of the incident and then not move him through it. You know, forget. The pc will sit there for a while, finally look at you kind of hostilely and say, "Well, when are you going to move me through the rest of the incident, you knucklehead?" Any auditor is liable to do this, because he's all busy with his computation of where the beginning of the incident is and how many

time it was and so forth. And the pc's been taking quite a while, let us say, to get to the beginning of the incident. And so he moves him to the beginning of the incident and then all of a sudden wakes up to realize at last that he hasn't moved him through the incident.

This can happen – not to you just once or twice because you're new at it; this will probably continue to happen to you, embarrassedly, now and then, from here on out. Because you've got an incident that's a trillion years long, or something stupid like this. And the pc's at the end of the thing and has had an awful time trying to find the beginning of it anyhow. And you say, "Move to the beginning of the incident at approximately wumpty-wump-bump trillion years ago." And you decide, "Well, while he's moving to the beginning of the incident I'll just catch up on my note of what he's just told me, because I didn't want to slow him down," you see? And you're busy writing and writing. You get interested in what you're writing, you know?

Well, actually, the pc wouldn't be upset with you if he didn't notice that your attention was on something else rather than following through the auditing command. Pc usually forgives this; doesn't cause any ARC break. But ordinarily, you – pc says, "Well, I'm there. So what?"

And you say, "Oh! Uh-ho-hah-ho. Oh." The exact auditing command that follows that, of course, is "Move through the incident to a point (duration time) later." That's the exact command that should be given him at that moment. And he'll go ahead and happily carry this out.

Well, this is a point where, if you're on the ball, you say, "Move to the beginning of the incident" and if you keep your eye on your meter it'll flick sooner or later. You don't have

to ask him "Are you there?" That's terribly bad form. You want to ask him "What are you looking at?"

"Well, so-and-so and so-and-so." And I wouldn't spend much time asking him what he was looking at either. As soon as I had any inkling that he was at the beginning of the incident I'd move him on through, because you can't make any real mistakes there anyway.

But the point I'm making here is the pc doesn't have to tell you he's at the beginning of the incident; he simply executes the auditing command. Causes a little bit of embarrassment sometimes, when you don't realize that he's executed the auditing command. But it is a communication cycle. It ha", taken place. The auditor said something, the pc's done it. That's all you expect. That's it.

All right. Now, the pc says something. It's a communication cycle. He'", not auditing you. It must be, therefore, a communication cycle. He originates see? And he originates something to you, and you receive it and understand it: that is a communication cycle. Communication cycle complete, right there. Now, to make it an originated cycle, you should signify to him in some tiny fashion that you have received it and understood it.

Now, if you try to phony this up and he says, 'Eugulala *blou-uboog,"* and *you say, "Hm-mm, hm-mm, hm-mm,"* and you don't know what the hell he's talking about, there is some mystic influence sets in at this point which you will see go on the meter. He knows damn well you didn't understand that half the time because he didn't.

Now, the auditor who specializes in this phrase should be stonewalled: "I just don't understand what you said," see? "I didn't understand you." "I don't understand what you are saying." "Don't understand." In the first place, that's lousy – a lousy approach – from the basis that it uses a very, very powerful word. Understand is the crossroads of A, R and C. And you say "don't understand," you're just asking at once for a complete ARC break. But more importantly, you have said to the pc to communicate the same thing again.

If you'll notice, he said, "I have a pain in my back."

And you say, "I just don't understand what you said."

And the pc will only say, "I have a pain in my back."

And you say, "I don't understand that."

And he will say, "I have a pain in my back!" We're all of a sudden seeing the buildup of the ARC break, see?

And you say, "I just don't understand that."

"I have a pain in my back!!"

You can build this up. But do you notice that the pc is saying the same words over and over and over? It's a peculiarity of Homo sap. If you indicate that you don't understand what he's talking about, he says the same thing again. He says the exact same thing again. He never varies it. What you want him to do is vary the explanation. What you're asking him to do is to help you get this, if he's got to say something more. What you want to indicate to him is he should tell you a little more broadly what he is talking about so that you can get a very good grasp of it. And if you are very clever and there's no substitute for cleverness; you can't give anybody a pat phrase with it because they vary all the time – if you're very clever, he will explain it to you in a half a dozen different ways. And then he understands it and so do you. But it's mainly you that's got to understand it.

Now here, basically and elementarily, we get the basis of an ARC break. I don't care what kind of charge is bypassed, the thing is a bunged up communication cycle, whatever else it is, see? It's affinity, reality, communication – these things are all out. It's a bunged up communication cycle, but what in it is bunged up? Detected and understood – those are what's bunged up in it.

How can you have a communication cycle where the communication is not fully detected and is not understood? How can you have one? It isn't a communication cycle, because the communication cycle is cause, distance, effect, with duplication occurring at the effect-point of the cause-point. That's a very pure, accurate definition. Not over all the years has there been any shift of that.

But look at this. Are you going to call this a communication cycle: cause, distance, alter-ised effect, no comprehension? You said, "Good morning," and she thought you insulted her. How did that come about? Well, it just came about by the nonexistence of a communication cycle. It was imperfectly detected and it was not understood.

Now, of course, it's not understood because it's imperfectly detected. I mean, how much more elementary can we get? Somebody rolls a lollipop in your direction, how can you detect what it is if you don't receive it? Oh yes, it can arrive within four feet of you, and you can look out there and see a lollipop. Then you could detect it without receiving it, which is another thing. This would also be an ARC breaky situation. It's detected, but you didn't receive it.

Usually you'll find TR 4 breaks down at this point. It's detected, but not received. Pc says, "I don't-I-1-1 don't think you have to keep – keep the session going much longer; I feel fine."

You say, "Well, we're going – we're going to keep it going as long as is necessary to fill in this particular period." You detected he said something, but you didn't receive it. You've said you didn't receive it because you didn't do anything about it. You said it should be some-

thing else before it arrived at you, and you have therefore busted down the communication line between the pc and yourself

Now, that was a very pleasant origin, wasn't it? Do you know that you could so work on that origin that you would have that pc – I don't care what pc, or how calm this pc normally is or how splendid and pleasant this pc is – you could get that pc into an absolute screaming fit, just on that, by just continuing that. Just continue it and continue it, and if you ever want to see an ARC break, man, just rig one of these things so that you don't receive what the pc says. And that can be done to any pc. Some pcs are really a bit below spitting in your face, but they just – you can just see them go *blyaaahhh.* And they just sort of pass out right where they sit. But it produces a fantastic effect. A fantastic effect.

Now, an auditor must realize that that is a primary effect, and that is a primary cause of ARC break. That is not one of the causes of ARC break. That is your textbook, perfect example. From the pc's point of view, there is cause, and there's distance; the distance is not covered, and the communication cycle does not complete. And that's it. That's it.

I don't care what pc you've got, you can reduce a pc to a screaming fit, no matter what this pc has said. You can just get the pc gibbering. A pc will just be shaking and exhausted in a very short space of time. And that's an ARC break. Well, why is it an ARC break? That's because both A, R and C are out. The combination of A, R and C equals understanding, and the understanding is out.

The intention is cause, distance, effect, and the progress of that cycle is prevented so that the communication is actually not fully detected. See? Not fully detected. This is a very, very interesting point in ARC breaks. That forms a woof and a warp of all ARC breaks. Not fully detected – partially detected but not fully detected. Nobody's going to ARC break going out here and yelling at a rock. You could go out here and yell at a rock all morning. You can say, "Oh rock, I hate thee," or "Oh rock, whither dost thou comest?" – anything you want to say – and you will go out and yell at the rock and talk at the rock and speak at the rock and so forth, but your expectancy of what's going to happen at the rock never does get quite up to expecting the rock to give you a TR 2.

So therefore, your estimate of the detection is not at fault. The rock isn't going to detect the communication to it, so you then don't expect anything to happen in the communication cycle, so therefore you do not ARC break. See?

Ah, but the pc is under a very, very definite detection cycle. The pc expects the auditor to detect the communication from the pc and understand it. And when that is thrown sideways – because understanding has entered into it, because detection has entered into it, because only partial detection or no detection has entered into it, in spite of the expectancy of its being detected – you can reduce a pc to an absolute shaking mess of jelly.

I'm not kidding you now. I see from your silence that you're either accepting this as too grim to confront, or you think I may be exaggerating it. This is not so. This is not so.

You can take the most common statement, such as "I feel pretty good now," refuse to detect what the pc is saying, don't duplicate it (don't understand it, in other words), and keep giving the pc evidence that you haven't understood it, and have that pc – I don't care how calm, cool and collected that pc has always suspected himself – in utter amazement at having been a shuddering mess of jelly, because he eventually will start screaming. "But I was just trying to tell you I feel perfectly good now," see? And it goes up, up, up, up, up, scream, scream, scream, and he'll then break downscale. You can see him go down the scale. "I was just trying to tell you…!" And he'll be crying, you know?

He gets on the same line – the stuck flow of his communication on the thing, and he can't get it through, he tries everything under God's green earth to get it through, and eventually he starts giving up and you can see his whole emotional Tone Scale follow this, then.

Well, that is a basic ARC break. That's fundamental. Now, you expect me to tell you there are many other kinds of ARC breaks, but there are no other kinds of ARC breaks. These mechanisms are all based on the communication cycle.

I don't care what the devil happens with the rest of the bank, the whole definition of bypassed charge is "partially detected." Now, it wouldn't become bypassed charge unless it were at least slightly detected. You understand? Somebody had to drag a magnet within a few feet of it. It had to be stirred up one way or the other for the thing. But that is a communication line which begins.

Going to restimulate an engram in the session. Let's take this as a bypassed charge source, see? The auditor does this, knuckleheadedly.

You want to be careful in MR, in selecting incidents, using things like "the first incident," "the earliest incident." Cut your throat, man! What are you talking about? You want "an earlier" incident, "the next" incident, not "first" and "earliest."

Why? What are you trying to do? Life's so dull you have to have an ARC break? Well, how are you going to get this ARC break? The pc can't give you the earliest incident on the chain but could give you the earlier incident than the one you just had. But you ask him for the earliest incident and you will kick in some earlier incident which he then doesn't reach. So, he now partially detects. And you have partially detected. Both of you, now, are guilty of partial detection of a started communication. And somewhere down deep it follows the same cycle as a communication cycle, right there – bang-bang-bang. It'll go all to flinders, just like that – bang-bang-bang. The more you scrape it up and the less you detect it, the more ARC break you're going to have. And that's all there is to it.

If you considered the time track a series of mines – nah, I shouldn't do this; some of you girls are timid enough when it comes to approaching some of these things. But let me give you this anyway. Supposing we consider it a bunch of mines which were activated magnetically. All you had to do was drag a magnet somewhere near them and they'd explode, see? And you want mine number four, and you're all set to sit on it and pull its teeth and not let it explode, see? So you throw a magnet down to mine number eight and then start to prevent mine number four from exploding – and you wonder what that shattering roar is! Well, you see, you just miscalculated on what one you were going to explode.

Now, a time track isn't quite that dramatic, but it gives you an example, see? You want mine number four, so you activate mine number eight. Now, what in actual fact is that?

Well, it's a bum origin as far as the auditor is concerned, but actually, the communication cycle is reverse end to. Somebody has told mine number eight to speak, accidentally. And mine number eight speaks, and nobody detects it, quite. See, it's partially detected. But it is activated and being partially detected now, will follow that same incomplete communication cycle. Nobody understands it, see? It isn't that that has life in it which is capable of doing that at all. It's just that a communication cycle, once begun, must go through. And if there is any type of thing that you want…

A big truism – a big truism: A communication cycle once begun must go through. If that communication cycle isn't permitted to go through, there will be upset somewhere, sometime, someplace.

In fact, most of the difficulties of mankind, if you wanted to lay them out, are simply begun communication cycles which are not then detected. You know, they're only partially detected, let us say. There it is, see?

Let me give you an idea. The President of the United States says, "I want all of you bums and all of the indigent and the poor and the pauperized characters – I want all of you to write me a letter and tell me exactly what I can do to help you personally, individually and personally." Gluck! Nobody would see in this the eventual revolution. Do you see what's going to happen? The guy's got no technology for handling the communication cycle at all. To say something like that would be weird. And yet the politician in a democratic country has always got this as his stock in trade. He's a glad-hander tell-me Joe, you know – this kind of thing. Eventually it starts exploding in his face. We are very adventurous in that I go ahead and do something like that.

Remember, there's a slight difference here. Slight difference here: You know how to catch the ball. We can catch the ball, we know the mechanics of this sort of thing, and generally the communication cycle doesn't have that as a source. I mean, it isn't that communication cycle that's at fault. It will have been somebody audited somebody, and they got into an ARC break and they bypassed some charge, and then the person wouldn't admit that they had by-

passed some charge, you see, on the pc, and then the pc gets more and more disturbed. And eventually they go to see somebody in the area, and eventually the HCO Sec. And then the HCO Sec tries to handle it one way or the other, but it misses there one way or the other. And it slides sideways and slips around and so forth, and eventually hear about it.

And once in a while I drop a ball on these, and I only know of one case extant right now where the ball has been dropped forever, as far as I'm concerned, because he got into the hands of a psychiatrist. Incomplete communication cycle was the immediate and direct cause of that particular action. He already, let us say – we know this – had a tremendous number of overts on the organization and everything was gone to hell, and he'd been in a mess for a long time, see? But a communication cycle – I didn't pay attention to it just as a communication cycle, just directly didn't. And the character sprung sideways, and there wasn't any way you could pick up the ball after that because there was a psychiatrist standing there. Haven't done anything to the guy – apparently some psychiatrist that doesn't use ice picks in the morning, only the afternoon. I only know one that's extant like that.

Well, that's a pretty good tribute to us, and it doesn't say, then, that the situation isn't dangerous merely because it's being handled. But look at this: It is a situation which is pretty doggone violent if it is not handled.

And if you're unaware of this… you realize that gunners and that sort of thing are always chucking around live ammunition, and they're not spooked about it at all. And you'll see people that work in oil well districts blowing out oil wells and so forth: They're always walking around with a pint flask of nitroglycerin in their hip pocket. They just couldn't care less, don't you see? Well, why? Those guys don't die and get splattered all over the place all the time. They're handling very dangerous materials. They're just familiar with their material. They know what that material is, see?

Well, how would you like to be handling, on a totally unknowing basis, the way everybody else does in the community, see?

Have you heard any conversations amongst meat bodies lately? Have you? Have you? I'll give you an assignment some time: Go around to a tea break in a construction works and listen to them. That isn't so bad as a cocktail party. A cocktail party is armored, on this basis: They don't expect anybody to hear them, so it's never partially detected charge. But this becomes pretty idiotic, pretty idiotic. You just stand there and watch the number of dropped communication cycles. And you don't wonder at all after a while why these people tear each other's throats out all the time. They're always partially detecting that somebody has spoke. And of course they get a blowup.

You see that you can handle the dynamite of the reactive mind. This stuff, you know, is not very dangerous. I don't mean to minimize it, so on. Frankly not very dangerous. It requires understanding. It never has been very dangerous.

But look how desperate it has made practitioners of the past. Look how desperate it has made people. Look how desperate a problem it is and look how frightened people can get if the United States – whatever you call it – is appropriating sixteen billion bucks to let psychiatry figure out how to give quicker and faster prefrontal lobotomies to more people.

Oh, I tell you, man, they must be worried! That worry must be proportional – at least one third as much worry invested in that as they have invested in the Russian situation, because that's about the proportionate amounts of appropriation. I think that's fascinating. You mean, they're so worried about this problem, they're so worried about the mind, that they invest treasure to this extent? They must be frantic to put it in the hands of the people they put it in, too.

I don't exaggerate. If you'd talk to most psychiatrists yourself, or if you were to – if you were head of a committee or something like that and you called in two or three psychiatrists or something like that to get testimony from them as to how to handle the community mental health – if you were just an average citizen – you'd probably wind up with your eyes like saucers. Police listening to these fellows testify in courts, and that sort of thing, have become. confirmed in the fact the psychiatrists are always crazier than the patients.

Well, look how desperate the situation must be if it's put into the hands of people who put up forward a mock-up of franticness to that degree, see? Let's just look up these coordinative factors, see?

Well, a psychiatrist, of course, is himself frantic. And if we didn't give him a hand to straighten out, he'll just never make it. And I don't think we'll ever help him.

Anyway, the point I'm making here is this factor of the ARC break. This factor of the explosive character of interpersonal relationship, this factor of explosive nature of social or any other type of personal contact, is looked upon in quite another way by other people than yourselves. It's looked upon as just *"Huuhhrh!* Everybody is dangerous," and "Everything is dangerous," and "Oh, my God," and it's all on an emergency basis, and *"Huuuhh!"* and figure-figure-figure, you know? It's fantastic.

Very few of you would say, "Well, you can't talk to him about that." Just show you that you've arrived someplace else, you see, than in that state of mind. Very few of you would be convinced you couldn't talk to anybody about anything. After you talk to them for a while you know you can handle the situation to some degree or another and so on.

Well, that's not the general state of mind with regard to this sort of thing in this society. "Talk to somebody about something? *Huuuhhh!"* See? "Impossible! *Hu-ooohh!* Dangerous!" What are these characters reacting to? They're reacting to a communication cycle. So the communication cycle is itself the most deadly thing, if mishandled, that interpersonal relation-

ships has, and the most valuable if it can be handled. The reason you can't fish the ants out and straighten them up is because you can't talk to them.

Desperation enters in only when communication goes out. Just remember that. You only get desperate – you can look back on sessions you've given: the only times you've been worried and desperate and that sort of thing is when you actually had the communication cycle go out, one way or the other. You want to say to this pc, "What the hell is the matter with you?" See? "What's the matter with you? I mean, I'm asking you a perfectly simple question here, you know? And you poor sod! If you can't answer that question, get some tone arm action, you've just about had it, man!" You know? You know this, sitting there, you see, and you sit there and you get tied up in the situation.

After a while you find yourself kind of peeved with the pc. Pc isn't responding correctly. Then you get all right when you do get the pc at some level that the pc is responding all right with communication; you find out that, much to your red face, that you had eight wrong dates on the case and that's why the TA action wasn't moving – something like this. You get these things straightened out, you notice the situation evaporates.

In other words, your response to the pc ebbs and flows to the degree that you can put a communication between yourself and the aberration that's bothering him and straighten it out and see the evidence of its discharge. Don't ever think you worry about a case for any other reason. You don't. It's that basic thing. You're having an effect on the case, the case is responding and the case is coming along, and that is what you expect to have happen, and therefore that is happening and all is well. And when that ceases to happen, when your breakdown comes in, and you can't seem to reach this pc with an auditing command, you can't seem to reach this bank with a communication of any kind whatsoever, you can't seem to untangle this knot by speaking at it or into it, you start getting worried and you start getting upset. And that's when you as an auditor become upset, and that's when you as an auditor become worried about your pc. And it's off – .

There's no reason for me to give you some pat answer, because there isn't a broad, pat answer to it, because cases have these various bugs and complications of which you're aware and which you get around eventually. But you look it over and try to find out what communication you're not getting home to the pc, and you as an auditor will feel better.

Now, if the pc is feeling like the devil, pc's feeling miserable about an auditing session or auditor, or something like that, you can just be sure that a – not his communication cycle; now, don't get this one awry. His – as an auditor, it's always your communication cycle that is awry, from your analysis of the thing. You want to improve something, you improve your communication cycle. But from a pc's point of view – a pc is very much the effect of very heavy and strong processes – and from the pc's point of view, a communication cycle is awry, but it can be awry in various ways.

It's awry. The communication cycle is awry. A communication has started, it hasn't been fully detected and it certainly hasn't been understood. And where a pc is going awry as a pc – you want happy pcs, you just listen to these little words and don't bother about anything else, and you just start figuring out exactly how you apply these to any case that you're auditing that you want to make a happier case one way or the other, and it'll work. And that is, some communication cycle has begun, it hasn't been detected – fully detected, you see; has to be slightly detected or it wouldn't be active – and it hasn't been understood. Now, if you put that in a nutshell as to the basis of low ARC or ARC breaks in pcs that you are auditing, you actually never need another line of anything. You need the mechanics of how to detect these things, you need a list of how many things these can be and so forth, but I give you that as a basic principle.

And you go at that as a basic principle, and you figure out the pc you're auditing has that as a basic principle, even when the pc doesn't have an ARC break. You know, there's no reason to figure this out. Now, get this: there's no reason to figure this out at all. Go ahead and figure it out and you all of a sudden will understand something about your pc that you haven't understood before. You're going to find a communication cycle out. I mean, it doesn't matter what pc, you see, where. You're always going to find a communication cycle out. What's the evidence? He's not OT.

For instance, he's always missing the telepathic communication cycle; see, he's always missing that one – that's always out.

Didn't go out in a session I was in last night. The auditor and pc practically blew each other's brains out by having exactly the same communication cycle on a telepathic wave hit midway and almost blow up in the middle of the session. It was an incomplete communication cycle had taken place in the session. Both auditor and pc thought of it simultaneously and almost went around the bend trying to figure out which one had thought of it first so as to unbalance – so as to unbalance this sudden ridge that had appeared in the middle of the auditing session. Quite an amusing situation.

Missed a goal, back in the session; you know, one of these skitter-scatter sorts of reviews of putting things back together again, redating and that sort of thing, and just up and missed a goal. Didn't realize any goal had been missed until the end of session, then all of a sudden thought of it. Either the auditor thought of it first or the pc thought of it first. The immediate result was a telepath on the subject, and it…! It was pretty weird. You watch some of this stuff you haven't seen for a long time, you know, you get tremendously intrigued. You say, "Huh! This stuff can exist," you know?

Anyway, we had quite a ball on that. But that's just a communication cycle of some kind or another which is completing. There are all kinds of communication cycles.

Now, what do you think of a pc who isn't receiving the auditing command? And what do you think of the auditor that goes ahead and gives auditing commands the pc is only partially detecting? Hm? Now, does this explain why you can run a "touch" process on an unconscious person, particularly if you're monitoring their hands? You say, "Touch the sheet. Touch the pillow." You say, "Touch the pillow," and then you have them touch the pillow, and now they know they've received the communication. You understand? You see that as a surety? So it even works at the level of unconsciousness. It's quite interesting.

What do you think an auditor is going to walk into who keeps saying, "Squizzle-wig the ruddy rods. Thank you. Squizzle-wig the ruddy rods. Thank you.

And the pc keeps saying, "Yes. Yes. Yes. Yes." What do you think the assessment at the end of session is going to look like? There's going to be a communication cycle missing. It happens to be the auditor's originated communication which is only partially detected by the pc and never understood. Now, what do you think's going to happen in that session? It's going to blow in some weird direction and there isn't going to be progress, and things are going to go to hell in a balloon one way or the other, and it's all going to be very hard to detect. You see that? All right. Now, let's look at another communication cycle. – The pc is – I'm not trying to tell you all ARC breaks are based on the communication cycle. You understand, the communication cycle is primary but goes awry at the point of detection and understanding. Understanding throws it into A and R. You understand? There are the affinity factors and the reality factors are what tend to make it not understood. This is why it's ARC. But still you can analyze it head-on on the basis of communication, you see, and it'll fall into that category. It's the reasons why the communication cycle didn't complete and was only partially detected when it should have been really detected, see?

Well, let's say the auditor has never cleared the auditing command with the pc. The pc has gone on answering this endlessly. Well, of course, you're going to get into trouble. What's the primary source of trouble? The fact that a communication cycle existed and the communication cycle was only partially detected, only the communication cycle didn't cycle. It didn't get all the way through. It was partially detected and it was not understood. So of course you're going to get into trouble.

All right. Let's take another look at the situation. We try to get engram four and we trigger engram eight. Well, we've started a communication cycle, don't you see, of engram eight without knowing we started engram eight, and we suddenly hear an explosion someplace and we can't quite detect where it came from. We look it over, and we find out the communication cycle was that we accidentally got the response of engram eight, but then we abandoned that somehow or another and we got four. So actually the communication cycle was not completed. Was directed to eight, was not received at eight, don't you see? It was received at four instead,

so therefore you've got a partial detection, and the pc didn't find it out, really, and the auditor didn't find it out, so there it remains as a sleeper, don't you see?

There was something that didn't go through. That's all you've got to figure on the thing, if you left all of your lists home. Something didn't go through. Well, it's only a question of how many things won't go through.

Well, the basic things that won't go through are affinity, reality and communication. And the basic things that those three things face are time. Time – matter, energy, space and time. It's ARC versus time. Don't you see that the livingness of the individual consists of ARC and he faces the material universe which consists of M-E-S-T. So you have the factors of M-E-S-T and you have the factors of ARC. And these confront each other. But this basically takes up the communication cycle. The individual communicating with time, or time communicating with the individual, goes awry. And as a result you get an incomplete and a partially detected communication cycle. All of these things end up in what you call an ARC break. This ARC break results in all sorts of violent emotions which actually could not be exaggerated in their violence. It's just an ARC break amongst nations that causes wars. And yet here's millions of people strewn out across the battlefields causing all kinds of work up here at the between-lives area. (Poor fellows – I bet they even have to work overtime. Let's hope they don't belong to the union or anything like that. The boys must have an awful time.) Well, that's an immediate, direct result of ARC break. Communication breakdown of some kind or another, with the affinity and reality attendant thereunto.

So don't think that because these factors are very simple and very easy to handle and very easy to detect that the results of not detecting them are not severe; and that the severe results that you see in life, interpersonally and in auditing sessions too, as well, are not catastrophic, or think that these results do not stem from this very simple little factor. Because it always does. An incomplete communication cycle results in bypassed charge – always.

The common denominator of an ARC break is bypassed charge. There's charge someplace.

But what do we mean by charge? We mean – well, of course, ergs, dynes and all the rest of it. Well, we apply it to the communication cycle and we mean that a communication or a charge has been excited and was channeled to go in a certain direction, and then was not detected and not understood, and that charge then explodes in a dispersal of some sort or another. It goes *blooey.* Don't you see? This is elementary. Bypassed charge is something that originates as the beginning of a communication cycle, and then not having been wholly detected or understood, remains then as bypassed charge. And it's very often not detected by the auditor or the pc. And you have a session sort of running at a low gear.

Now, don't think these things are just explosive either. Pc just isn't feeling so well lately, so forth. Well, you've got some sleeping bypassed charge of some kind or another you

didn't pick up, that's all. Bypassed charge, we mean we bypassed getting the completion of the communication cycle, or we carelessly started a communication cycle which didn't get completed. That's all.

Accidentally did so. It's very easy to do. We say, "Give me the earliest engram on this chain." Little while later, pc has an ARC break. We say, "Let's see, did I miss an origin, or what did I do? What happened?" Then you hit, finally, "an earlier incident was restimulated." This usually settles it away one way or the other, particularly if the pc spots what was restimulated. Bang! There goes your ARC break.

Now, it's attended with great magic. But the magical look at it is the fact that we have the anatomy of this tremendously explosive stuff – the explosive stuff of interpersonal relations. We know the magic of that. We know how many different ways the thing can be – a communication can be begun and not be detected and therefore become bypassed charge. It's a lot of ways in which this thing can be done.

Well, knowing those things, you should be able to handle a session better. You should be able to handle a session better. Pc says, "Oh, I – I don't think we ought to go on too long – "

And you say, "Very good." Just as your words fly out the window, at least have the grace to realize that you are adding something into the communication cycle, if this then bears bad fruit. Just realize how come it came about. It's a partially detected communication, wasn't understood, far as the pc is concerned. You say, well, obviously that leaves you in a position of always doing what the pc says. No, it doesn't.

"Well, good. I'm glad that's the way you feel. All right. All right. Yeah, okay. Okay. Don't want to carry on too long. All right. All right. Well, good thing that I'm perfectly fresh, and I hope you are the same, because I intended to go for another two hours." We find that one cycle isn't the other cycle, don't you see? You've originated a new series of communications on the subject; you haven't slapped the old one in the head. You only get into trouble by slapping the old one in the head, don't you see?

Pc said, "I think you ought to go all over the track and restimulate all these engrams, because actually the best thing to do is to get to basic-basic, which is tomorrow."

And you say, "All right."

You take a look at this, you understand what he said. You may not understand why he said it, but you sure understand what he said. And you say, "All right. Good enough," and go on and do what you're doing. He still isn't too upset about the situation. See, he only gets upset if you slap him in the face.

Therefore, you've got to be an expert in the detection of a communication that has begun. The better you are at detecting a begun communication – the better you are at this – the

less ARC breaks you'll have. But actually you needn't worry about ARC breaks, because you can handle these things before they get catastrophic.

Now, that's an ARC break. That's handling the ARC break. These are the basic fundamentals stripped right down to rock bottom. Your ARC break assessment form is simply the number of types of communications which can be started and only partially detected by the auditor and the pc.

Now, some of you are prone to this (now, this can be done; so you are led astray by some wins): You can say, "Well, an earlier incident was restimulated in the session. That's what's wrong. That's what the ARC break was about," and the pc suddenly feels better. And if you go on that way, and you get wins, and you say, "Boy, this is the cat's – . There's nothing to this. This is absolute magic," right up to the point when you get the ARC break that you didn't assess the right line for or you assessed the wrong list for or the pc didn't quite know where to go to in order to look at and is still fubble-fubbled. You didn't find it, even though it read on an assessment.

So therefore, there are several actions undertaken in the detection of one of these things, and one is to assess it on the form where the ARC break reason lies. That sounds idiotic for me to say something like that, but if the ARC break is in the session and you do an R3R ARC break form, you're not going to find the ARC break, are you? And so forth.

So the right form, the right list – the right list comes as primary in this. And if you don't find it on the right list, why, you better get another list. In other words, if you don't find it, get another list. Your commonest error on these things is not now that the lists are not complete, but that the lists are in several pieces to save you time, so your commonest error is wrong list. You actually didn't find the ARC break. You didn't find the communication cycle that began and so left bypassed charge.

Now, the main mistake you're making or could make in this, if you do make any mistake on it, is not making sure that it's all straightened out with the pc. That's the biggest common error. You say, "Well, that was an earlier incident restimulated. That's all right. Okay," and go on with the session. The pc's sitting there frying. It wasn't an earlier incident. Or he didn't know what incident it was, and he's totally baffled. The ARC break charge has not been spotted and laid to rest, see? It says right there in the bulletin on this that you better take it up with the pc and find out if that's right.

Well, you can go to the point of dating all of the things which you dated wrongly and finding and locating and dating all of the bypassed incidents. In fact, it could become a total production which will go on for sessions, trying to clean up one ARC break. You understand? A good stunt in this regard is to find the order of magnitude of the bypassed charge. That doesn't let you in for more trouble.

"An earlier incident was restimulated." Yeah, but what? Who? What? Where? What's? Which? Which? What's? Which? It's all you can find, is an earlier incident was restimulated. You don't know what earlier incident was restimulated, you don't know what the hell, and all of a sudden the pc says, "Oh, yes. And, yes, it must have been – " and so on. And, "I wonder when that was. Can you date that? Yeah, there it is," and so on. "Can you date it?"

Good trick is just give it order of magnitude: "Is it hundreds of years ago, thousands of years ago, millions of years ago, billions of years ago, trillions of years ago, trillions of trillions of year – ? It's trillions of trillions of years ago. Y9

"No kidding? All right, that's fine." That's the end of it, see? That's a way of parking one without getting yourself all solidified in a dating. You know that the pc's attention is still stuck on this thing, and he's still trying to sort out what incident it was, and that sort of thing. Well, one of the ways to get rid of it is find its order of magnitude – not go ahead and date it and find its duration and run it by R3R when you, in the first place, were doing 3N. You understand? You can go that far.

But locating – locating it on the list – is where the semantic error turns up here. You don't locate it on the list. The list only locates the type – the type of charge bypassed. In other words, the type of communication cycle that began and was never completed, never detected, see? That's all. That just locates its type.

Now it's up to you to take the additional steps of locate and indicate to the pc the charge. In other words, doing the assessment is really not locating the charge. The charge is not on the list, it's in the pc. You get this? I'm not saying that just to be clever. The truth of the matter is, it's only the type; the list will only give you the type of charge. And you haven't accomplished the step of location. You've only found the type, see? People are saying "All right. Well, you locate and indicate. That means you do an assessment. Bang – that is located now, and we indicate it to the pc." Well, the funny part of it is, this is so good that even that works. See, there's where you get tripped up. You can short-circuit it to that degree and still make it work.

Well, recognize what you're doing. That's terribly short-circuited. You've only found the type of charge. You haven't done the location step at all. So in some ARC breaks you are totally baffled as to why the ARC break doesn't evaporate. You're totally baffled. You say, "Why doesn't it go away?"

Well, the primary reason is you haven't done it on the right list. That, oddly enough, is the most flagrant one. But you've never done the location step at all. The assessment is not the location. See? And an earlier incident was restimulated. You say, "All right, an earlier incident was restimulated." Well, the magic of it is so great that occasionally this works, and it gives you a bit of a win, so you say, "Well, this ARC break assessment stuff – pretty good. Ha-ha! That's it. Yeah, fine." And it'll work like that, and it'll always work if you've got the right list.

And you've produced this minimal effect on the pc and pc isn't all coming apart now at the edges.

See, because that works, this whole system tends to get very short-circuited. You see, the assessment is not the location. That isn't the way you locate the charge. That is the way you find the type of charge that you now want to locate. You go down this – pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa-pocketa – and sometimes when you go over it you retrigger it, and your dirty needle turns off, and your next time down, why, it reads purely. See? You've had a dirty needle on the first assessment. Expect that as normal. Next time you go through and flick those off that were still in – bang – one is standing out there clean. Now you can say, well, it says so-and-so and so-and-so. "That's an earlier incident was restimulated. Earlier incident restimulated

that's what it says here. How do you feel about that?"

The pc says, "I feel lots better. Yeah, it's fine."

Well, let's not plow up the field after it's plowed, man. See, this is just handling ARC breaks as they occur in session. You know? No reason to go into this, stir it all up again, find some more bypassed charge, bypass… no, you had it handled – let sleeping dogs lie. Your assessment, location and indication all occurred in the same breath, see? Then you verified to find out whether or not it was okay, and obviously it all occurred in the same breath, so why are you going to go into any trouble from here on? Everybody's satisfied, why are you going to any trouble? You're just going to stir up more trouble.

But remember, you have done a very short-circuited, shorthand version of an ARC break rundown. That is very short-circuited. If you got the right charge, it can happen. But, "Earlier incident restimulated. Yeah, that's what it says here. An earlier incident was restimulated in this session."

Pc says, "Ah, well. Okay now, that's good," and starts getting interested in something else, see? Ah-ah-ah, that's all right. Nobody's going to quarrel with him doing that.

But you say, "Well now, how do you feel about this?"

"Ah, maybe so, but – uh – yeah, it was that earlier incident that was restimulated. Aorrwr-rahr! That earlier incident was restimulated!"

You haven't found the charge, man. And the first thing you should suspect is not your assessment but that you had the wrong list. Reach for another list. Do you know that you can do 3N and inadvertently do some 3R and be accidentally into 3R making ARC breaks of 3R? You can sometimes do R3R and get inadvertently into 3N, and your ARC break lies in 3N. Do you realize that? And sometimes if you have an ARC break on R3R and 3N, it is never the session ARC break list. But sometimes after you've cleared them up you then have to get the session ARC break that resulted from having had those out. You get the stunt here?

But remember that there is an assessment, a location and an indication, and it has to be all right with the pc. So there are four steps, always four. You could say five: Finding out that the pc has an ARC break would normally be the first one. But that is the score on your ARC break assessments. And recognize – recognize those steps, in handling the existing ARC break, actually exist to that number, and that the assessment is not the location. The assessment is just finding out the type of charge. You might have to go quite a bit further to find the location.

You say, "Wrong date." You've done nothing the whole session but date, you see? The ARC break's caused by a wrong date. Well, it reads well and it is a wrong date, and that is the ARC break, but the pc says, "What date is wrong?. "

Well, you think that you now have to redate everything in the session, and so forth. Well, just call off a few of the dates you found and ask if they're right, that's all. Bang, bang, bang, bang, bang, bang – do they read as wrong dates? That's one way of doing it. Another way of doing it is "first half of the session, last half of the session." There's a dozen ways of doing it. I'm not going to try to teach you that trick. But you can go ahead and locate it right on down. Well, what is the right date for that thing? One of the ways of doing it is simply get order of magnitude. That makes the pc very happy. That causes it all to go back into place very smoothly.

You ran the goal "to spit." You thought it was in the Helatrobus implants; you have a wrong date on the thing all the way along the line. And you find the goal "to spit" had the order of magnitude of trillions of trillions of years ago. It's good enough. Not to go on to run the goal "to spit," you understand, but to find out that you'd found the goal "to spit" and you want to get it out of your road so you can keep on with the goal "to spat," see? Well, you find the order of magnitude for the goal "to spit" and it'll move out of your road.

These are all just shorthand methods of handling the thing. But you are dealing with an assessment for type. You are dealing with a location. You are dealing, then, with indicating what that was, and then you are dealing with another factor here, is; was it all right with the pc, does he feel okay now? And that's what you were doing it for in the first place, so you're a ruddy fool not to find it out in the last place. Okay?

All right. Well, because you can get away with it on the basis of do an assessment – bang – you say, "That was it," and suddenly your location and indication take place just like that, see? You don't, then, break them down and realize that they are that additional steps.

If you wanted to know a complete list of all types of ARC breaks in this whole universe, you would have to find all types of communication that could be partially detected when originated and all the things, then, thereafter that could be misunderstood. And you would have a full list of all ARC breaks. Because we're dealing with the mind, we know the ones that are important, and we know what really causes the explosions and we include those. Otherwise, 150 million books printed, each one, to the size of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica,*

could not give you a partial list of the number of communications that could leave bypassed charge by being incomplete.

Okay?

Audience: Yes.

That's the lot. Thank you.