

# PROJECT 80

A lecture given on  
22 August 1963

Thank you. Well, what is the day?

*Audience: 22nd of August.*

Twenty-second of August. Boy, you're lucky! You got all the way up to the 22nd of August. And you're still alive. Boy! Some people have all the luck!

All right, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course lecture. And we're going to recapitulate now on the itsa line and levels of auditing and et cetera, et cetera, et cetera. Going to talk to you first about Project 80.

Why 80? Why does Ron always use these 80s and so forth? Well, 80 is a mathematical trick, because you turn it over on its side, you see, and you have infinity. And it's a sort of a mathematical joke. You've got an infinity, you see, and you've got a zero. So you have embraced the totality. So it's just a mathematical trick of saying "all."

Now, Project 80 has to do with organization targets and dissemination and technical planning. And this has a great deal to do with organizations, and it has a great deal to do with anybody who is in practice and has a great deal to do with anybody who is in Scientology.

And the only reason a Resignation of Project 80 has been assigned to it at all, is because there's a whole cluster and collection of bulletins and policy letters which will be coming out along this line, and there are a great many publications will be coming out along this line. And you'll recognize them when you see them because they will have designations like "Scientology One," or "Scientology Two." And the embracive action of what to do with these things is included in Project 80.

Now, you're watching here now the dawning of 1964, which is the year of Scientology for everyone, you see? And what has happened here precisely is a lot of guys have come along, and we've been all together in plowing through the research and it's been very trying at various times. Research is very far from ended when you can make a breakthrough of the magnitude of the itsa line, here, just in the last couple, three weeks. But we've come all the way along this line, and we've seen it changing, changing, changing, and this and that coming and going, and stable gains and a lot of hope going along the line and all that sort of thing.

Well, this has made in essence a special breed of cat. And we're not in a situation where we're going to lose such people, see? Most organizations' activities, forward pushes, in this particular universe are up against continuous loss of personnel. It's one of the most crippling things that they have-the loss through death and casualty and implant and this, that and the other thing all the way on up the line, you see? And frankly, if anybody could live long enough he would be rich. Just think of that for a moment. Supposing you went on with some-at least the vigor that you might have at thirty or forty, and just keep going! Keep going with no wipeouts.

Well, let's take movie stars. Let's take movie stars. All during the-all during the 40s and 50s you had the movie stars who had made it in the 30s and 20s, which is quite remarkable. Those that came up in the 30s, particularly. John Wayne, Gary Cooper-these characters, you see? And you just saw them on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on and on. My God, he's-Gary Cooper playing the lover at sixty-five was quite interesting, I think. But they simply were not necessarily good, they simply were persistent.

I don't know anybody who ever handled dialogue worse than Cooper. But they were persistent. And what happened to their rivals? Well, it wasn't that their rivals didn't make it or weren't so good or something like that; they simply fell by the wayside, preys to various ills. And even those that were prey to considerable ills still made it. Like, look at Judy Garland, the ups and downs and so forth. Persistence. If you could just keep going, you yourself become a sort of an institution, don't you see?

Well, we've got this particular factor, to some degree, licked-at least the solution of it is well in view. As I told you yesterday at the end of the lecture, why, give me a problem and I'll get the solution to it, usually. I've been operating on the basis that if I can conceive of the problem-I amplify that a little bit further-if I can conceive of the problem, why, I know we're about forty-eight hours from what made it a problem. Not the solution to that problem, which is a MEST universe reverse-end way of looking at the thing, but how did it become a problem? And this is organizational, you see? And we see this pretty well, so that I've become cocky to this degree: I know that if I can conceive of what we're up against, and I know if we can conceive of what we're up against, we can-in dissemination and technical and that sort of thing, we can whip it.

It's all very important to our future progress. Now, we are also, incidentally, working here with the problem of vanishing people. And that problem is the one that causes most organizations to deteriorate and go by the boards.

Now, we've had quite a struggle coming up the line one way or the other. That struggle's a long way from over, but the murderous-the most murderous aspect, organizationally, is well within our realm of resolution, which is losing all your people. In any given-any given twenty, thirty, forty years on this planet-on this planet, any organization practically loses the totality of its people. Now, we're not up against that. We have a lot of

people here who in the last (some less than this) five, six, seven, twelve, some thirteen years, have been going along this research line with me, see? And things have ebbed and flowed and you've seen it all changing and reversing, and the ink was dry on the bulletin so therefore it must be out of date-this kind of thing. Right here this particular unit of Saint Hill has had to cope with shifts and changes, but I myself have never compromised with this for a moment. And I think you're awfully good sports, all of you who have put up with this, to put up with it, because I'm sure you understood that if there were something better coming up you didn't want the something worse just for the benefit of stability.

You see, in essence *we* are the stability, when it finally works out. Well now, it may not be apparent to you, and it may be apparent to you, particularly those in Z Unit, that we've pretty well got Level Four-Scientology Four, the road to OT-that's pretty well wrapped up. You could know a few shortcuts, there's a few refinements, there's a terrific number of releases to be made on this subject. For instance, I discover lots of exciting things along in Four that aren't yet released. For instance, just last night I got my hands on the pattern of the O/W sequence itself-the overt-motivator sequence, rather-got the whole pattern, tailor-made. And it's a lolly, man! It's a doll! It's a GPM of sorts and its own special breed of cat. And there goes your overt-motivator sequence. Well, there's a lot of stuff coming out like this, you see?

But the modus operandi by which you find that material is there, and the type of material which is going to be found has already been established, and the various ways by which you use this material on the pc has all been established, don't you see? And you call that a wrap-up, see? It's an incomplete release, but a research wrap-up. Nobody is going to be working very, very hard to find some new type of incident, or something like this. They just aren't. There was one more type to be found after the GPM, and that was the screen-type incident. There's some ramifications of postulation-type incidents and so forth, but these we already have the technology for. We already have any kind of a drill you ever heard of for a Thetan Exterior has already been wrapped up years ago.

So call that level a wrap-up. It's just practically office work to put the stuff together, see, if-that which isn't together. Anybody finishing the Z Unit here at this particular time is perfectly competent to handle all of this. He'll pick it up and say, "Oh, oh, yeah, yeah. Well, that's one of those," you know?

So, in view-in view, of course, is a wrap-up of the between lives, and stripping it out so a person doesn't do a report-back. Now, that's very, very pertinent-very pertinent situation, and I thought that was going to be very tough. It is a little bit tougher than I thought it was going to be. You can undoubtedly strip out the report-back mechanism without doing much else, but the between lives is full of GPMs. Ha-ha, isn't that nice! And they're all negative on the beginning end of the screen and they're all positive on the "end" end of the screen, so of course the positive-negative type goals, the di-it's a dichotomy, you see? Those

that are positive dichotomy are as you leave, and those as you arrive are negative, so of course that collapses one on the other to a marked degree and makes it a very nice mess.

Fortunately they're not given with very much violence and the earlier sequence and series of these things is given much earlier, before one has actually entered the civilization which you now unwittingly find yourselves. They're the Train goals, and we have the pattern. I've got to confirm this and dabble around with it for a while, but it's that kind of work which we're doing.

Exciting enough in its way and certainly valuable enough and vital enough to make OTs. But I don't think that anybody has very much doubt, except if he's been dropped in the middle of session, that we're going to have all of this worked out and it's mostly a matter of grind away and get the GPMs out of the road and keep the tone arm flying and so forth, and gradually work it out, work it out, and hold the pc's hand through the rougher passages of it and rough it out and then we'll finally have arrived at that.

It's a matter of-once more it's a matter of shovel work. It's more comparable now to moving a pile of coal from point A to infinity-zero, see? It's just-it's just auditing. It's a number of auditing hours. There are some rules I'm working out that make it faster and easier, such as if you get your paws on a GPM, the running of which gives you tone arm action, do not let it go till you have run it and its whole series. This is the faster ways to do this sort of thing, you see?

If you are stripping off a between-lives screen and you suddenly find some incident that's way back in something-or-other land, just don't just date it and let it go-run it. And when you've got it run, come back to the screen lives-between-lives screen to strip it down some more, don't you see? And eventually the whole puzzle all comes apart and everything falls apart in your hands, case all goes back to battery, and bang-that's it.

That's just a matter of working at it. But what is the central action of this? The central action of this is auditing. And auditing's central action has to do with keeping the pc's attention directed to those significant portions of the track which give him tone arm action and which take his case apart. That's the highest level of professional auditing. There it is.

Well now, look. You know how long you've been on the road, and look how much you've studied, and how much you've sweated and groaned and that sort of thing in order to achieve the technical level which you right now have achieved. That applies to anybody here. You know how far you've gone. That's quite a ways. That's quite a ways. If we expected everybody to go that similar distance, we would lose. And what we happen to have-we have a group now who have come along over a tremendously long distance and who then form an advised cadre. They would know which way these cats are going to jump; they've been exposed to just about every brand of process that you can imagine and so forth.

Now, this is very important. This is very important to have such people. We're not going to lose these people. It's going to go on for quite a while. But how about all of those other blokes, huh? How about all those other people? Well, to expect them to graduate up the hard way-it's too much to expect. A lot too much to expect.

They're operating at certain levels of reality, and that level of reality establishes their ARC. And if we're going to bring off any coup with regard to large public acceptance, broad dissemination-if we're going to bring off any coup on this particular planet, we're going to have to pay attention to that ARC.

Now, this bloke is plodding along there, and the highest level of his understanding of mentality is "Women are all alike." This he knows. When he finally decided that, wisdom burst upon him. He felt pretty good. Every time somebody throws a coffee pot at him or something like this, why, he just sits there and he's satisfied as can be. He grabs hold of that stable datum, inserts it into the middle of his thinkingness, and he knows now the answer to it: Women are all alike, see? And that explains the coffee pot, and that explains everything, you see?

And we come along to this bird and we say, "Hey, bud, you're a convict. You live on a planet called Earth; it's part of the Marcab Confederacy. What you got is a whole lot of GPMs and you got to run these out, see, because they're positive-negative items that go into a dichotomy." Now, you give me his ARC. What is his ARC at that moment, see?

*Audience: Broke!*

Broke but good, that's right. Correct! At least it's just going to be kind of unreal. He's not going to be very happy with us. Well, what then in essence has happened-is we've carried along here by our bootstraps, at many times great personal sacrifice, certainly through lots of disappointments, upsets, through tremendous loses, all kinds of things-we've carried along here, and we have been making our way and we've been getting along just fine, and the gap between us and them has been getting wider and wider and wider, and eventually we find ourselves in an informed ivory tower which of course we can take off from, to Lord knows what but we've left no bridge behind us.

So the particular cadre of Dianeticists and Scientologists who have come forward to this point could very well just sever at that point and we all goes our ways selectively, or we do or we don't, but we have left no bridge behind us. I consider that somewhat important. Particularly since it's going to take a long time to bail out things and square things around and that sort of thing.

I want to point out to you, this planet is in a slightly different situation than other planets in that-not to go space opera on you-but this planet has a prayer of not getting tilted. That is, what you put into this planet has a tendency of remaining here. There's a probability that it will, don't you see? Well, this is not necessarily true of the other planets in the

immediate vicinity of this planet, because very often you get into a condition of warfare of some kind or another and things happen.

Now, all I'm talking about is that to get any kind of entrance into the social strata of nearby planets and so forth, to get any entrance into that is fairly improbable. They're far more likely to explode-being very tightly and intimately governed, they're far more likely to explode and go up in smoke. Do you see what I mean?

The-you've got your feet into this one, and this one does make a rehabilitation center of one kind or another. It's worth salvaging-with all the other crude expletives I've been using about planetary tilting and so forth-it is worth salvaging.

Now, what happens to the other immediate planets that are connected with this confederacy in this system I could not bet on just for two seconds. I just could not bet on it. In the first place, these are invasionary planets; they possibly were facing some type of invasion here into this particular galaxy. There's probably political situations in existence and you and I would not know what of, don't you see? And I know they've made a considerable incursion into the thing, because I know that the Espinol Confederacy used to control this very much and I found out the other day that their return platforms were closed, were barred off with speakers, you know, saying "Get away from here," and "Report to the ones we told you to report to," and "Get away from here," and "We don't want anything to do with you." In other words, their return points are closed.

Well, that just spells nothing but defeat, see? So what is this? Now, is there some other planetary system-is there some other empire system which is deeper in to the heart of this galaxy which is going to backfire against this one? I would say probably yes. Probably yes. There-probably this is coming right up over the hill. I mean it probably is not long. Maybe this confederacy or this activity right now is in trouble. But conquerors nearly always spare the jails. Did you realize that? The Allied troops going in-Auschwitz, Belsen, places like that, they didn't knock those apart. They knocked apart the belligerents' property, but they didn't knock apart their jails. All kinds of political situations complicate this picture.

I'm not trying to tell you what they are about or the solutions to them. I'm merely saying that these are complicated and I've only vaguely touched how complicated it might be, see? We can't bet on that. We actually can't bet on the preservation of Earth. But we can bet on this-that this planet has a better chance of becoming a rehabilitation center than other planets, see. That's a very faint bet, don't you see? But supposing-supposing now, you have not left any bridge to-in the rehabilitation center, don't you see? Well then, everybody in this area, now, just keeps floundering around without any contact and no way to get up on it, and very mad at the only group of people that could assist them. I don't think that's a desirable situation at all. In fact, I think it's a highly undesirable situation and I think it could actually impede what we ourselves are trying to do. We've got to leave-we've got to leave a bridge.

Now, organizationally and in private practice and other functions, our feeder lines into the public are very, very weak-extremely weak. But they are not weak administratively, they are weak technically. It's technical weakness. Now, that's why I've circled around and come back to Scientology One as a heavy point of concentration in research and development.

Now, this is all very, very interesting that we would consider Scientology One a heavy area of research and development. Well, the other is wrapped up. I'm working on it as fast as I can. You see little things sandwiched in amongst other things. For instance, you just saw a bulletin-if you've gotten it yet-how to handle the pc's postulates when encountered in GPMs and engrams and that sort of thing, you see? Well, you see stuff like that all the time. But this other stuff is coming out now which is this bridge. And that bridge is Project 80. See, that's just Scientology for everyone. Now it requires, actually, that we study Joe and Bill and Pete a bit and find out what they agree with and utilize that agreement to improve their ARC-not with us, but just to improve their ARC -up to a point where we can bit another level of agreement. See? In other words, raise them from a level of ARC, from where they are, to a next gradient point of ARC. And then at that next point of ARC put them in the way of getting their ARC improved up to the next level. And they come to Scientology Three, Clear. And then put them up from that up into a higher level. Do it by gradients, in other words, not with crush and crash.

Now, the eight dynamics, various scales, the ARC triangle, the dynamic principle of existence-all of these things are too high for Scientology One. Interesting, isn't it? So they comprise Scientology Two-HCA/HPA level. And you're back to-you're back to what you might call thirty-, sixty-day HPA training. That means a lot for a Central Organization.

Well now, how could we possibly make an HCA or an HPA in that length of time? It's because of our breakthrough on the itsa line. It's this piece of technology which has made this possible. And we couldn't have climbed this hill with the technology we had, because we had to have technology that could be grasped so easily that even if misinterpreted somewhat would still work. Now, that's an easy one. So we come back to that. And we get various definitions for these various levels.

Now, in studying over this problem, I am now supported by a tremendous amount, and growing rapidly, technical data-technical results-from the itsa line and this exact approach. And I'm very, very interested. Why, IYM also very interested that some of you, as auditors, haven't yet coped with the level of win. See? You're living here on cloud nineteen, see, and you know what a terrific win would be in auditing, you know? Well, run out a whole series of GPMs on somebody with terrific tone arm action and so forth. You're hoping for that level because you know you're setting them right straight up for OT, you see? And you overlook what is a big win to a pc. For instance, our Staff Auditor has just made that mistake. He's worried. Of course, he's trained up to the nines, you see. And he got a perfectly raw piece of

meat and their first session she couldn't say a word, really. No benefit, nothing. A few repetitive questions were asked her, practically spun her.

Next session, she was very happy to have been able to talk to the auditor about these things. Now, that was her gain for the session. But the auditor hadn't been able to get her to talk about and get good TA action on what he wanted her to talk about, so he was regarding this as a lose. See, he was getting worried about the case. Isn't that right? I just saw her folder and I haven't had a chance to talk to the auditor yet; he's at a disadvantage here. Well, he's getting his itsa line in on a brand-new, fresh pc. And probably what he doesn't realize is she is violently pro-medicine oriented, and would ordinarily be what you would consider an impossible case to process. In a couple of sessions she's got him-she's talking to the auditor and getting a little TA action doing so. Well, I consider this is terrific, because this case would have barred us out a few years ago, or even a year ago, even a few months ago. It's at the level of win. See? You have to learn to settle for these little wins, see? See, you have to settle for these wins on a gradient. So he's winning. He must be doing an awful smooth job of auditing to get over all of that. And in actual fact, the moment he started putting in the itsa line, just as such-even though she wasn't particularly interested in talking about what he was putting the itsa line in-he had a win. Think of that! I consider it fascinating!

Tells me at once the auditor must be doing a splendid job. And it tells me the case must be winning and it tells me this case, which I would have considered unauditible, who has been refusing auditing left and right-not really refusing it, just ignoring it; much worse than really refusing it-and he gets the itsa line on this person a little bit and he gets a win. So I think he must be doing well. That case must be doing well. And he doesn't have to do anything very, very extraordinary about what to get this case to talk about. See, as long as he can keep the case talking she'll win. Aw, that's an awful easy level of auditing.

So here we are, operating in the operating climate of where we've known this is very hard to do. So hard to do we've almost forgotten that we ever hoped it could be done! And there it is, sitting in front of us, doing it! And it's almost too spectacular to be accepted.

How long has it been since you took somebody who was half-seas over or upset in existence and tried to audit him, and wouldn't be audited and had to then fall into an unauditible category. When's the first one of those you ever had, and when was the last one? Well, now those are the real loses, man. Because, you see, you didn't get to process him at all! So it's a win if you processed him at all. And you actually, when you get your hands on this, you will be completely surprised to find out that in this kindergarten of auditing you have very stellar results obtainable-so obtainable that medical healing is contained in this line-solutions to the problems of medical healing.

Now, I'm not saying we are going to do medical healing. I wouldn't be caught dead with it! I've done my-I've served my time that way. And pretty poor. So don't think we're



downgrading a result, is all I'm trying to put across to you. We're not downgrading a result, but it's going to take us a little while to get used to the level of result.

I had quite a shock on this the first time. First time, I just-I had worked out completely, in the absence of tone arm action the pc wasn't winning. See, I'd worked this out, theoretically and so forth, and I started putting it to use and kept very close tally on it and found out that the significance which I would erase off the case did not have a value comparable to the amount of charge that was tone-armed off the case. And I was completely flabbergasted. It was a matter of watching pcs over twenty-four hour to forty-eight hour periods after a session, and it was astonishing that the session following good tone arm action on the pc-regardless of the completion of that session, regardless of the significance of the session-established a very high level of win for the pc. Pc felt brighter, more alert and so forth.

Now, you could get tone arm action and too much significance entered into the situation and be pressuring the pc along very hard in the direction the pc had to go, and yes, you were driving the pc toward his ultimate goal and that sort of thing, but the pc wasn't particularly happy about it. It was trying-like trying to get speed out of a motor boat half-full of water. Not lots of charge was being released, and slopped over, and the pc felt groggy and weary and sluggish and so forth. You nevertheless were making it, you understand.

So the optimum level of cheerfulness as far as the pc is concerned, and the feeling of getting a case advance, as well as actual case advances, lies just in the direction of the itsa line in and the tone arm moving. You can almost delete "on what," see, at your lower levels of auditing.

Now, when I say-I used that "medical healing" unadvisedly because they'll be wiped out soon if our plans mature. These birds-here we've got a guy who is-who's got a-he's got a wonderful case of lumbosis and so forth, and his lumbar has been bothering him for a long time. It's Douglas fir or something, and termites have gotten in there, and this is predisposed toward disease, this area. A predisposition toward disease.

Well, I think this is quite remarkable, because if they treat the disease they never get at the predisposition, so something else has got to happen to the lumbar. So the obvious thing to do to the lumbar is to surgicalize it-cut it out so there is no lumbar. Obviously the solution to trouble with the lumbar is no lumbar, see? But they've completely overlooked the predisposition of the lumbar to disease because of trauma. They keep concentrating on the bugs, you see?

Well, this has a-perhaps has its limitations. But what exactly does this do? Do you know that if you could get somebody talking about his health, or his lumbar-for instance, you're handling that right now; you actually are trying to head in and get her to talk about something about her health. Something. And you'd probably have to make a very fancy assessment to find out what it is. But the final analysis here is if we can get her talking, this

pc, about her health, we'll eventually get her talking about her lumbar, and we'll find out that the cures and solutions and decisions and discoveries and cognitions and comments and considerations and hopes concerning that lumbar, in their Aggregate, caused her to have lumbosis. And if we can get those off with TA action, we will then have a recovered lumbar. It sounds utterly incredible. Doesn't apply to broken legs *yet*. See? Probably have to set a broken leg.

I'm just trying to give you where the zone goes. Your Scientology Two is probably the open-sesame to healing. We've got to accumulate a lot more material on this, and I've-as I've said already in descriptions of Scientology Two and in the process of getting this material together-well, my whole statement is, is we're not putting in this HCA or HPA's hands weak tools!

Just because they're simple, they're not weak. And by using the itsa line, we possibly could take this person and cause him to be very effective in the treatment of some physical conditions from a spiritual/mental level that have never before easily surrendered. See, I mean we've got a door open there. It isn't just cracked open, it's crashed open!

Now that means, then, that your HPA/HCA level training is just exactly in the zone of where you've been here with the itsa line and the TA action, with a slight direction of the pc's attention-method of direction of the pc's attention-mostly to this lifetime, to limbs, to conditions in their life and so forth. So we have to train him at this level. We have to train him in the Auditor's Code; we have to give him, of course, some TRs; we have to tell him about the Axioms so he sees that the subject has breadth and depth; but mostly, we tell him about the ARC triangle, the CDEI Scale, matter, energy, space, time, form and location; we tell him about the dynamics-see what I mean? And when we get him all grooved into this line we teach him the tone arm of the meter, and that's it.

Now, this is certainly several cuts above Scientology One and is an expectable cut, because he'll be able to use that information, particularly if we put it together so he can use it. Now, puppy to the root, with great curiosity and facing the unknown, he will of course (and his instructors may of course) wish to charge up into the character of this bloke and his name, rank and serial number before he came into the Marcab Confederacy, and considering it very important that the auditor know this, and then it's very important that the auditor know something about 3N, it's very important they really know how to run an engram, and it's very, very important that they know how to run this and run that-and in the course of a few weeks they try to press in an education which has actually taken you something on the order of what? That's heading for no success.

But if they could learn these other factors and well, and if they effectively produced a result for them, then that whole group undergoing that training and handling that processing would win. They would win all the way across the line. Their ARC, then, would again come up.

Let's take Scientology One again. We study this guy and that guy, and we find out what they are in agreement with-already what they are in agreement with and what they are antagonistic toward. And studying these factors, we give it a Scientological orientation and organization-that's Scientology One. You got a datum, something-if you realize that psychology has not even come up to that level that we're aspiring toward in Scientology One-you realize these guys dabble around with stuff like this and consider it very wise? Such as, "When troops get letters from home their morale rises."-psychological report rendered to the commanding officer-"Therefore I advise that you have more mail transports to the front lines. Chief and God almighty of the Psychiatric Division of the Army of the Republic, signed this date. . ." Scientologists look at that and say "Oh, *ppft!* Why is the morale of front-line troops down? The morale of front-line troops is down because they don't get mail from home. Bull!" This bird, then, is occupying a point of swindle to some degree, because he's supposed to be a high-caste character that knows about these things, but what he does is put out these fantastic banalities. See, we're not even-we're not even going to go that low for Scientology One.

Scientology One says that it is possible to have a happy marriage. Improbable, but im-not completely impossible to have a happy marriage, see? That's its level of discussion of marriage, you see? Not "Marriage is a marvelous experience which can be..." you see, all built up on the line. And, "How do you actually live a happy marriage? How do you get along with children?" Well, you make the whole of child psychology something on the basis of-something on the basis of "When the kid tries to tell you something, understand it and acknowledge it. Don't ignore it."

Employee-boss relationship. Communication formula with regard to the employee, with regard to the boss. The project of saying, "Good morning" to somebody over a period of forty days, until they finally say, "Good morning" back. You know, the use of. It's just getting into communication. See, your common denominator of all that.

Now, you turn-you turn you loose on a platform, talking to the mothers of East Orange, New Jersey, about their children. Now, look at your levels of choice. There you are, facing all of these girls, and they know you know your business. Now, you can say, "Your little Rollo has just been through the between lives area, has the following GPMs . . ." Or, you can say-or you can say, "Your problem with little Rollo is basically one of communication..." I think you could take off from there. I think you could really take off. What is he trying to say when he cries? How to handle him. How to handle him.

I'll give you a case in point. The stuff's effective! But it takes a while. One little boy-one little boy went-I don't know, it must have been the better part of four, five months-without feeling anything but hostility, but at the end of that time became very anxious to please. And what exactly was being used? Every time he said something, great care was taken to find out what he'd said and to acknowledge it. Every time he showed up one said hello to him. This brought about the total reform, as long as we deleted out of existence any

punishment the child was getting during that period. And this reformed a very bad boy. That doesn't sound like much, but you'd find people who were not particularly ambitious would care to undertake a project of that character within their own limits long before they would undertake a more complicated project, and the joke is that that project happens to be real, the case history I gave you is perfectly correct, and it is a way of handling the situation and is quite remarkable.

Now, there's-odd thing about it is, is once you've given them a single datum, you have an enormous series of complexities that add on to the datum, and you'd just be amazed at how many questions there are that arise around that complexity, and you can ama-imagine after you've answered a few questions from the floor on the subject of what you have just told them you'd be surprised how your repertoire goes up and how you finally find out what they want to know. And you may be incredulous at what they want to know, but nevertheless that is what they want to know, don't you see? And you, with a great deal of technology at your fingertips, of course are able to evolve that rather easily.

Now, it doesn't really put you on a withhold with regard to the thing.

"I understand that you Scientologists believe that everybody has lived before. Is that true of little Rollo?"

"Well, Madame, that would be up to little Rollo. If he wanted to tell you that, why, I'm sure he could, or would."

Experiment of exact nature was carried on at Wichita, Kansas one time. Little Rollo in this particular case was about five, six years old, and he was over at the swimming pool when Mama was asking this somewhat snide question. She was intending to be rather nasty. And she said-I said, "Well, why don't you ask little Rollo-involved?" and so forth.

And she called little Rollo over and she said, "Now darling," she says, "you don't remember when you were a baby, do you?"

"Oh yes, Mommy!" he said, "I remember when I was in your tummy," and went off and dived into the swimming pool. It's all very interesting.

Now, where you cut this line and how you design it and what you do with it, and so forth is all regulated by what people can go into ARC with. And there's the only point where a dissemination program or training program would fall down.

Now, you have not any good example in me. Just-I'm not a good example of this, because I'm mainly talking to you. And I don't care if stuff wanders out into outlaw and wildcat hands-I can take it. I simply say what is with regard to what I am now looking at, at Scientologists, and some of them think I'm kind of unreal lately, or batty and so forth. I am sufficiently insouciant and confident, and confident of my ARC with Scientologists in general to know that they will forgive me, and also know that they will look it over and run into it

themselves and say, “Hey, what do you know!” and all of this sort of thing, so I’m operating on a different-on a different basis to a marked degree in that particular regard.

It doesn’t mean that you have to withhold what you know about it. But you certainly have to talk to people at a level where people can talk, if you intend to have any ARC with those people. And therefore your basic dissemination area throughout the public must be at a level that people can go into ARC with. The technical material must be such that they can use it, and there we go.

Now, you could make a Book Auditor who will get fantastic results, and I’m-I was just telling you I was very proud of the fact I’ve been studying some of this in just the last few days, and I’ve been getting a lot of material on this itsa line and so on. And RIC is-you’ll be getting it in proper bulletin form-but it is simply a list of questions that anybody can add to, that you get people to talk about to get in the itsa line. That is all; that is what you do.

And it’s a bunch of canned questions, but it actually could be thousands of questions. And I can see it now! I can see some Book Auditor with a dictionary of these questions. Guy’s got lumbosis, and here are the cross-referenced things with regard to what this guy can talk to that will cure up his lumbosis. See, this is how you get the RIC run on his lumbosis. And you can get a very complicated cross-coordination of the number of questions he could answer that would finally add up to his lumbosis, see? And it would-which is much more surprising-it would answer up to his lumbosis.

Now, that’s Book Auditor line. Of course, we expect a Book Auditor to have many more failures, flubs, be incapable of possessing sufficient self-control and discipline to keep from flying in the pc’s face. We expect this kind of catastrophe, but oddly enough, my experience at this level of auditing has been rather good. It has been rather good. And if we put into their hands very, very securely, stuff which they actually can co-audit on and get results with-merveilleuse! And that’s your RIC, don’t you see?

And you hear somebody starting to dive for GPMs, something like that, say, “Well, perfectly all right for you to dive for GPMs’ perfectly all right. But your pc-your pc probably feel better if you take the HCA Course and the HHS Course and go to Saint Hill and then come back and run it on him. You’re liable not to make as great a mistake.”

And he’ll say, “Oh well, I can still run it.” Call you up in a couple of days and say, “What do I do?” you know?

Say, “Well, all right. That’s good. Why don’t you ask him about things he has not quite liked about auditing, or . . .”

You’ll find your brains are sufficiently stretched even handling that level of co-audit, you see, with just RIC, that type of question. But they gonna get results! And that type of processing going to raise their level of ARC. And if this type of processing also exists on co-

audits and so forth, you actually can divide Scientology One into two grades: the nonauditing and the auditing. Well, the nonauditing are going to stay much less advancing and so forth, but remember they will still exist. Old Dianetic and Scientology groups always had people in them who wouldn't ever audit or be audited but were members of the group. And they very often would form a majority of the group. They hung around the fringes of this and they never dared quite get their toe wet. And you had other members of that group who considered themselves very, very upscale because they did audit, and they were auditing somebody and being audited and so on.

Well, the natural evolution of this thing, then, divides it into two, is the nonauditing and the auditing levels of Scientology One. So therefore, you've got to have quite a bit of theory that matches up with Scientology One that people can talk about. A lot of theory going along with it.

Scientology Two-Scientology Two is capable of getting tremendous results. I think even an old-time auditor wouldn't really believe the results that are obtainable at that level. The backbone processes-the backbone processes are R2C-any assist line, or anything like that-but R2C. And getting complicated now with R2C-this is a complicated process. This is R1C, but an assessment predetermines the thing. I can give you a very rapid rundown of what R2C is, and I think you'll find it's a workhorse process. It's with an assessment. You have your new expanded CDEI Scale, and you have an expanded scale of eight dynamics. That gives you two lists. The session is begun and the tone arm is used, no needle actions take place, and the person is given the expanded CDEI Scale to inspect to find out which one of these things best characterize his life.

Now, you don't expect this assessment to take place in any specific period of time. It might take ten minutes and it might take fifty hours. As long as you can get tone arm action out of the assessment, why, you're in! You don't care how long it takes him to pick over this little CDEI Scale of cards and try to figure out which one most applied at what times in his life and where and how and which and what they are and how they relate and that this is a pretty clever scale and-I can see some guy getting stuck for a hundred and fifty hours just doing nothing but examining this scale, see? See, so I'd never discourage him or speed him up from examining the scale, because there's a lot of residual tone arm action to be gained right there with that scale.

Well, let's say he finally came up-anywhere between ten minutes and five hundred hours-he finally comes up with a level. See, you don't care if he picked it right out or it took a long time, as long he was getting tone arm action while he was doing it, that's the only condition. And we-he's picked out this level. He's decided that that is the one which most applies to his existence. He's got that now. All right, that's level X.

And now he thinks he's all set and you're now going to do something else, but you don't give him any chance to do that; you repeat the operation, you give him the eight

dynamics, expanded. They're expanded with their subdivisional dynamics, you see? And he has to inspect that list and tell us which one he has been most concerned about and how, in this lifetime. What one has he been most concerned about in this lifetime? And that's again anywheres between ten minutes and five hundred hours, you See? That's a repeat and a replay of this thing.

It actually doesn't matter whether he does this slow or fast, don't you see? As far as his case gain is concerned, it doesn't matter a darn whether he does a fast assessment or a slow assessment.

So we've got these two scales now, and we have-Y has been picked out as that dynamic he is most interested in. Therefore our question for R2C now becomes XY, all in one question-"False actions about animals." Anything that you want to do. Now, there's a third one-if you want to put your auditing question together perfectly, you could have a third one which has "decision, solution, cure, consideration, ideas about, concern for," don't you see? You'd have a whole bunch of verbal actions if you needed it to continue to put your question together again. That just makes your question neat. What has he been with regard to animals and so forth? Well, he's had concern for them. All right, that's fine.

Now "concern about falsity about animals," and you just plow right down the middle of his case, man. You've got a wide-open significance that-and it'll make that tone arm flow like mad. And what have you done, essentially - you've matched up the ARC triangle against matter, energy, space, time, form and location in a neat little package, and he's away. See? And you've matched it up on gradients so that it first starts out ARC versus ARC, and he gradually gets around to where he can confront MEST a little bit, you find out he'd eventually swing into the sixth dynamic, and he'd eventually swing into the seventh dynamic as you repeated this operation.

I think you are looking at clearing this lifetime. I think that's what you're looking at. I think this is a process which would bring about a free needle. Now in Two you also have-this is upper Grade Two, and we would expect this on a retread. We expect this on a retread. You would have R2H, and you would have any other process that-such as Prepchecking and so on, is relegated more or less to that band, not really to the band of HPA, because that's a needle action.

So what do you do? You just take up the itsa line, purely, and then at the lowest professional level you take up the tone arm, and then at the retread professional level you take up the needle. You're moving these things up gradually, consistently, on a gradient, and you've got people who at every level can produce a result. It's whether or not they can produce a result that permits us to do this trick, don't you see? If they were unable to produce a result at these levels we wouldn't be able to do this trick. So I've just been glowing - glowing like a well-oiled halo on the subject here of watching this itsa line produce some remarkable results with regard to it.

Now, if you're going to run anything like this type of an activity, you're going to pay any attention to this at all, you'll find out that another element enters the scene. Just as the devil always entered Paradise according to the very best implants of the O/W sequence-the overt-motivator sequence, rather-they're all apparently associated with the devil and hell. I think it's quite interesting. Devil, hell and punishment. The-we already found heaven, now we've found hell. Very good.

But just as the devil always enters in, so does the ARC break. There's always the auditor who couldn't keep his mouth shut. And we have a tool which requires the use of the needle. So we make the ARC break assessment a specialized activity. And we try to bring it home to everybody that if this person is ARC breaking all the time, that the person has to have an ARC break assessment. Well, this gives us a crack at the auditor as well as the pc. So you say bring the pc in for an ARC break assessment, and you go ahead and give the pc an ARC break assessment.

Now, as a Central Organization operating a special division or department in which this is done can also keep an awful lot of co-audit activities running here and there throughout the field, and can keep a lot of teams straightened out (when I said co-audit I meant just individual teams) and can keep an awful lot of stuff on the fire and can keep a lot of-actually, professional auditors who are having trouble one way or the other, can keep them patched up by giving their pcs some ARC break assessments and straighten them out. We also would have a crack at the auditor at that time. Right? And we lay the fear of something or other into him on the subject of breaking up the itsa line and chopping off the pc, or evaluating for the pc, basically by pointing out-follow the Auditor's Code.

And in such a way-in such a way, you'd have a high level of effective activity going in a community or an area. If you add such things as testing and very cheap co-audits, and if you add some little course in which an HBA can get a classification-you know, he can come in and he can study these drills-this little basic drill on how you listen, see, and how not to cut the line, and give him some gen about the Auditor's Code, and that's it-he's a classified auditor, see?

We straighten him out to that degree-the organization or the auditor in private practice is always willing to give an ARC break assessment to somebody who is falling apart, and straighten out somebody's pc for him, don't you see-why, you'd have a well-knit, well-running, very orderly forward progress in the community, providing that ARC is maintained to agree with the public at large, to agree with the partially indoctrinated, to agree with the first levels of professional. If the ARC is there to match, why, of course we will communicate like mad.

The whole secret of our communication is the fact that it's up to us to establish the level of the communication line. And we have to some degree considered it rather dishonest to establish a line less than everything we knew. Well, it's not true. It's not true. There's no



particular reason to hit everybody in the head with everything we know. But we all do it. We all do it one way or the other. I suppose we'll continue doing it. I can hear it now-this Book Auditor, he's sitting there, and he's-we're trying to do an ARC break assessment and he keeps coming up and he says, "But all this person will talk about is wanting to moo. And they just keep saying 'to moo, to moo, to moo' and so forth, and I've gotten them to repeat it several times but it gives them a headache!" I can hear you now. He gets the equivalent of a Saint Hill Course in the next fifteen minutes, you know? At high velocity!

But I'm not at a-for any instant even vaguely pretending that this won't happen. See, I'm not pretending for a moment that the program will go forward perfectly and without a hitch. There are various reasons why it won't go forward without a hitch. And one of those reasons is, is some people get nervous when they see action in their vicinity. Gets them nervous! Gets them nervous. They see fifteen people in the Registrar's office and they know that's too disorderly. People have no place to sit down or anything like that, the place is crowded, the Registrar can't do her work. She's putting money in cash registers, you know, and they keep dashing around having trouble with the invoicing machine, and commotion going on, she's leaving pieces of paper on the floor-very, very unneat. And so they know what to do, so they cut down the line going in to see the Registrar. That's obviously the right solution to the situation, because they want things neat.

And you see testing being knocked out in various ways. I think testing - there was some forty-some ways testing was knocked out in Johannesburg one time after it was put in. Those forty ways were counted. I think they were the subject of an Info Letter. I've forgotten how many there were. Such things as leaving bicycles across the walk into the testing office, don't you see? Making sure that no forms or blanks were available. Making sure that the person in charge of testing had too many other things to do and couldn't test.

Now, that isn't being really vicious; this is the consequence of people who are upset about motion. And they get too much traffic and there's too much going on, and they get-they get emotionally disturbed about the whole thing, so they want to shut it off. You find that kind of action. And you finally find people who think that if they could just be left quietly to -by themselves, the best solution to the whole thing is to go get a rich man someplace and have two auditors process him and audit each other, and a hundred years from now, why, somebody will make it. I've had that advanced to me, by the way, two or three times as the only real solution to Scientology.

Well, that's awfully quiet! But the funny part of it is, it's been tried and it always failed. I think that's the most remarkable condemnation of it. Oh, they'll have other things going along that will be hashed up one way or the other. You'll have situations of the unusual solution. They can't get the tone arm moving. They can't get the tone arm moving on an itsa line, can't hit the right questions, so they ask you. And they-you give them a qu-the answer, and they despair of ever fitting in the answer and they go off and run something unusual. And

then they can't get any tone arm motion there, as a matter of fact it's a little higher, so they run something more unusual. And the tone arm is a bit higher and they run some - needle getting tight now - so they run something that is even more unusual. And you keep telling them to do the usual, and then you find out to your horror that you have a pc you've got to put together again with tweezers practically. You can only bleed off charge one microamp at a time, see?

There will be casualties of this sort of thing. There's going to be some - you say to this husband and wife team, they have no training of any kind whatsoever and you tell them that they should co-audit. All right, and they go off and they co-audit, and you hear the house is burned down or something. They're busy getting divorced now, because they got rid of some O/Ws inadvertently, don't you see, and the other one couldn't take it and blew up in their face in the middle of session, and all this sort of thing. This is not-you see, this doesn't make for peace! That's what I'm bringing home. There's a certain amount of catastrophe involved in this sort of thing and the only thing you can do is minimize the catastrophe. Just minimize it. And hold it down and keep it along the line, and then not get pinned on this dissident member of the congregation and that character who is raising trouble and that situation, and then just get pinned totally against these things and forget that everywhere else it's just running fine. These various things occur.

Actually you can practically destroy an organization by getting your attention too fixated on two or three small evils of one kind or another, and you don't realize that the rest of the organization is running wonderfully well. I had that happen to me in Johannesburg. My attention got riveted and I had-the situation was picked up long after I could do anything about it and the attention and so forth got riveted on everything but the fact that the staff was doing extremely well. And the traffic was going as well as could be expected. They were getting their throats cut from a certain quarter and I think to this day don't even realize that they got their throats cut from that particular quarter.

Outside pcs were being used to collect money individually and the poor staff was not getting any of the money it was working for and therefore was working for practically nothing, and then being told by the very people who were doing it to them that it's all very sad and they should do something extraordinary, and so forth. And these guys were cutting their throat. And the second I tried to do something about it, the situation was so triggered and so explosive and so forth that it practically spattered over that corner of Africa. Just now getting back together again.

This kind of thing occurs. And that occurred from the result of getting your attention too fixated upon some evil and trying to take this evil apart, forgetting the rest of the organization, don't you see? And it was running all right. It comes from what you could call "crusading." Crusading in ill-advised directions.

You've got mobs of people who are walking in for the PE lectures. Mobs of people, see, they're just walking in, and they sit down and so forth. And the PE director makes his biggest mistake when there's that guy named Swinkopf. And damn that fellow, you know! He comes in and he sits down in the front row, and he sits there with a sneer on his face, you know and so forth, and the whole lecture gets twisted around Swinkopf Guy's talking to fifty-five people out in front of him, you see, and yet addresses his lecture to this one dissident character who is probably a commie anyhow. See, it doesn't make sense, you know? If Swinkopfs get too much in my road, why, I always tip off a couple of guys, the next-in the next lecture when he comes in, why, you put him out. They always do it very gladly.

There's no sense in, then, narrowing down the whole of the forward progress and all the information you've got and all the theta you could generate, you see, to take care of Swinkopf. The odd part of it is there probably aren't a dozen people in the United States, actually, who are against Scientology. I mean, count them numerically. There are probably not a dozen. Look at the amount of time and effort being invested in that particular line. Great!

Two birds at the AMA, fellow by the name of Keaton and a fellow by the name of Field. And these birds throw all the brickbats, generate all the press, kick all the fuss up that is kicked up, and so forth. Well, there's probably a member or two of the AMA board that sicked them on, and there's probably some bird down in the FDA, who-I don't know, maybe he's done something-I don't know, maybe he got somebody in a family way at some time or another, or maybe he takes all the drugs that are sent in-something. Anyway, this guy feels absolutely imperiled by something or other, so he's just Johnny to the root on it, and so forth.

Well, there's no doubt about it, they can cause a lot of fuss. But just let me point out something to you. You don't see me spending very much time concentrating on that particular dozen. Because every moment of time I spend on them is wasted on the remaining-count them, man-a hundred and eighty millions. It just isn't a figure, you see, that's proportionate one way or the other. Probably all evil generates from too great a concentration on evil. You can neglect a fantastic amount of entheta and still get by. And you keep the show on the road and you make it very easily. But the way not to keep the show on the road is get so fascinated with how the show is not on the road while it is still on the road, that you, of course, contribute to not getting it on the road. You eventually contribute to stopping the show, don't you see? You have to be very careful along in this line.

So there are fifteen co-audit teams going in your immediate vicinity and so forth, and there's one team that is always in trouble. Every Saturday night that you have off, it's an ARC break assessment for this pair. They've blown up in smoke, see? And there it is, there it is. Now what are you going to do about it? Man, I'd lay down the law! I'd say, "Now, look! Either sign up for professional auditing, go into the local HGC-something on this situation." Because why? Because they're taking up all the time you actually should be spending with the remaining fourteen teams-which is a bad economy, a bad estimation of effort, don't you see?

There are means of taking care of these situations. And what you want to do is form up ways of taking care of these things and take care of them on a routine basis, not on an emergency basis all the time, well appreciating and predicting that things like this are going to occur. And then traffic will run. And then the consequences of stirring up such a tremendous activity in the public at large and so forth, actually will be very easy to handle. And when we get-finally get through with this thing, we'll be handling a lot more than we're handling now.

This thing has fallen out into its natural consequences. Finally when you go out through the top you can generally pick up a simplification at the bottom. We are a very long way from totally finished with research, but I think that when we've gotten down to the basis of where we have shaped auditing at its lower levels totally around the definition of "auditor"-one who listens-if you can get any simpler than that, I would like to hear about it.

Therefore, I think that we have laid in a safe basic, and have made a safe assumption that this is good dissemination channel material, and will remain constant enough for us to project it very easily and heavily and consistently and keep it going for a long time and get it all grooved in, and get things shaped up in that direction, and take the general public and make 1964 the year of Scientology for everyone.

Okay? Thank you!