

# ARC BREAKS AND PTPs, THE DIFFERENTIATION

A lecture given on  
11 May 1965

Thank you.

Thank you. Well now, I think that's probably an appreciation to the release we made today. You're living in a – you're living in a different world, and right now, than you were a couple of weeks ago, and we get even with people these days, we release them!

Anyway, we've been knocking them out here, left, right and center with these new Power Processes, and of course I've been D of Ping straight down on this line, Mary Sue's been doing the folders and so forth. And it's nothing new for me now to come in the office, and all of a sudden somebody tears in and says, "Well, we just made another one!" see? And as a matter of fact in the last two hours I see Mary Sue sitting there telling me, "We just made a Release, we can't do anything with her, her needle is just floating free, and it's at Clear read and that is it!" And this is starting to get very routine. These things that we worked for for months in the past, and so forth, the state of release, is of course the old state of Keyed-Out Clear. And what we used to work for in the past and get sporadically on this person, that person and so forth, we now get one for one.

They walk in here, they've had it! In something—in something under fifty hours they'll be a Release, and that's it. And this is quite astonishing. And that's why I say the Bridge is open. And that's for sure! And not only that but it's walked back into the public thirty-four levels down. We know we can audit anybody who is thirty—four levels below Zero.

That chart by the way doesn't say that there aren't additional levels – the new Gradation Chart – below that point, but I have not had time to do scout work in a – in an institution to look at cases, and I tell you if a psychiatrist can agree they're nuts they really must be!

But anyway, to make a long story short, these are very, very exciting times, and you haven't really begun to see the tidal wave yet. I'm just seeing it now, on my desk, in amongst the few of us who are in there slugging on the Case-Cracking Unit of Review, and so on. The auditors'

doing a marvelous job, and Mary Sue's doing a wonderful job on this, and we've been working day and night this last week to get out there confidential bulletins upon these particular subjects.

You say "Confidential?" Yes, because some Class W Auditor auditing these things would just—well he'd not only just mess up, he'd mess up himself too. The weird part of it is it's too simple. It's too simple. It's – it requires too pure a rendition, you see, no additives, no monkey business, no this and that, see. You've got the processes that take people up the line, and on fairly average cases as a matter of fact, our – these new Power processes which are the Class VII or the Clear's processes on the aberrated person and so forth are just *WHAM!* Crash!

And I've seen—I've already seen an auditor try to audit these things who was not himself up in a terrific case state and he just went *wham!* himself Got the idea? He can't audit them. Case isn't far enough advanced. But, this is it, man. This is it. Now we know we can make Clears and so forth, that's up there above VI, and OT, that road's been open now for some little time. People have been slugging away at it, and that sort of thing.

But the news is, is thirty—four levels below Zero, straight to release, in under fifty hours—crash! The only way you can get that, by the way, is become an intern on the—commercial!—an intern at Saint Hill for Class VII after completing your Class VI work. And I would advise you very much to do so, but if you do so you will have to work in an organization because we're not about to tear the public to pieces. You understand? We're just—we're just going to release people, and this is one we don't spoil.

The road is wide open for the human race, until we find somebody out in the backwoods of Montauk, I won't mention any names—like Homer and Berner, because that'd be libelous and so forth. These characters grabbing ahold of somebody and trying to run end words on them. Oh, for God's sakes, how silly can you get, see? And trying to show some bird in the raw meat, you know, "Well all you have to do is sit down in front of the meter..." and the next thing you know the guy is wrapped around a telegraph pole and it takes four derricks and seven Class V's to dig him out of it, see. Bah!

That's a vicious—that's not a careless thing to do, that's a vicious thing to do. And I don't think it's intended any other way. It's "Let's fix them up so they can't go." Well, the way to do that is to grab some upper—scale process that is overwhelming the guy, and overwhelm him but good, and we have—catch them once in a while, that have been overwhelmed by upper—scale processes, and then we start to release them for the first several hours while all that pours off of them is the upper—scale processes they couldn't dig. Do you follow? And they just pour off as terrific locks, right on present time, the guy is just boxed in like mad. His own case hasn't been touched, don't you see?

So these things have to be handled with some skill. And we've got it made, and we also have got the horsepower necessary to make it stick. And we sure jolly well intend to do so.

I had good news today, most orgs are resurging on the State of Emergency which they've been in, and one or two orgs which are still down are arguing with me about putting in my administrative policies. But they're still down. I wonder if there's any coincidence? Anyway, anyway, these are great days to live in.

We're going to see quite a few new students, and some of you who have been hanging fire around here—I just opened up the trail for you and so forth. Took Clay Table out of your road here in the last 24 hours. You may not have noticed this but I have swept it off the line as a process.

No particular reason to have it as a process, you can put it clear down to Level Zero as a demonstration. Process is marvelous stuff with which to demonstrate a definition, and that sort of thing, but I've taken it off the road as processes. When people start to process raw meat with Clay Table, and so forth, they neglect one small point, but they neglect it so uniformly around the world, that we better take it out. Because Clay Table, peculiarly amongst all other processes, requires that the auditing question be answered. And it's sufficiently uniform that auditors in HGCs have not been able to get it answered, that Clay Table is the one they fall down on hardest. So I was looking for things to take off schedules. It wasn't that Clay Table was bad, it's red hot. But I was looking for things to take off so I swept Clay Table out of your road.

And also cut your auditing checksheets to ribbons, just last night. So there's only a few processes left on your auditing checksheet. So, you should be able to move up through the top fairly rapidly now. Doing everything I can to clear the way for you, and I think that you will find it fairly clear.

The situation internationally, also, has improved enormously; I might make a little bulletin on that effect. The attack on Scientology in the United States has disintegrated into a rout for the government. They are now being attacked—not mildly put—by the United States Senate, and by—and very shortly the House is going to open the ball on the FDA.

Australia, their report from the inquiry has been delayed so long—the usual course of those reports and inquiries they have down there. They seem to do this quite routinely, in Victoria, they have inquiries, and then they forget about them. And the last three inquiries, as desperate as they were in progress and so forth, all wound up in no legislation. And so that one will undoubtedly die—end too. Because its report isn't even due in Parliament for months. And

Parliament is recessing. And all of that kind of thing is happening. And if we can find Victoria, why we will set it to rights, one way or the other. If we can find it.

You know, you're only dealing with a tiny little postage stamp on the face of the earth and what seems to be bowling everybody over, down in—in Australia is this fantastic news which keeps coming in to them from the United States, you see. Government runs up white flag, you see. This sort of thing. They seem to be very hungry for that news. Actually it's been very hard on the staff down there, mainly, they've been knocked around and knocked around and knocked around.

True, they're so far off—policy that they set themselves up to be knocked around. But nevertheless they did get knocked around, and they're—they've had it pretty hard and heavy. And they'll be snapping back along the line.

Most HCO Secs and Assoc Secs in the world—I don't think this—you know this—are being flown into Saint Hill over the next many weeks, and so forth, routinely, one right after the other, for briefing, for releasing and for *jelling* in on the new org board, and so forth. I mean, we're getting ready to roll. We mean business. And this will completely change a lot of peoples' view—points in a lot of ways, and get a lot of questions answered and so forth.

It's very funny, these people fly in here, and their own area concerns are so terrific, you see, that they—these things have got to be answered right away. And they're rather impatient with this idea of being put off, and that sort of thing, and could be jelled in. But what—what they really don't know is that the new organizational setup solves all the problems they brought in with them, see. And this—that is the cue to that.

But anyway, things are moving very hot, and very heavy, and you're very fortunate right here at this particular time not to have graduated last month!

Anyway, the—there's a lot of you that I'm looking at right this moment I want to see go through this new Class VII Review Unit, just as soon as you get through with VI. So let's whip it up, huh? I could let you in on what else is going to happen but I've talked about enough here, now, and so forth.

Probably people thought I was exaggerating or something of the sort, when I said we were going to take the planet. But I've always meant just that. See, I haven't meant anything else. And the plans are now taking shape and form, with which to do this exact thing. And the big difficulty on this is you've got to do something like this so that it doesn't overweight somebody's plate. An executive, for instance, who is—who's got so many lines coming in to him, and he's so crossed—up and he's got so many jobs, expansion to him begins to mean simply overwork. And

he begins to say, “Oh, no! We’re not going to get any bigger because I can’t do any more!” don’t you see.

So we had to set up an organizational plan which would relieve an executive of this—this terrific burden, and which permitted the organizations to go up in size. We have that, and we are right now in an organizational phase where we’re just at the end of Dissemination—I know that sounds odd, but it’s not at all. We’ve got to hand out the materials we’ve got, in the way which we already have planned, you see. So Dissemination as a phase in Scientology, although it will now manifest itself; is actually toward the end of its action, see.

For instance, I could tell you what to lecture to a bunch of people in a PE that would sound to you to be about the easiest thing that you ever did in your life. You’d say, “But that couldn’t possibly have anything to do with a PE,” and yet they would all be enthusiastically howlingly for you, right straight there—from that straight on. For instance you’ve seen the gradation scale. Well, if you lectured to PE about the need for change, you see, things should be changed. You of course could lecture by the hour, see. And you could say the most banal things, you see, like, “Your home life really needs to be changed,” see, “World affairs need to be changed.” You’ll find the world press is instantly right in your pocket. Because that’s the only message they have to sell.

See, the really hot—shot reporter is simply selling the world on the idea that it needs to be changed. Of course, he’s got the idea of how bad it is “over there” and so forth, but nevertheless your world press does this, it—they jump aboard the bandwagon—they’d go down as far as disaster, they do this, that and the other thing, but they’ll come right back and say there should be a change, you see. And that’s the featured news, you know. “US should get out of Vietnam.” Well, it’s in need of change, don’t you see. I mean, it’s all covered. You find your leading, hot, front—page news stories are always the need of change, you see. “People shouldn’t be so careless to set apartment houses on fire,” don’t you see, “because of the. . .” You know, I mean it—whatever they’re saying, it’s a protest. And of course every revolutionary group in the world has only this message: “We need a change!”

And frankly, revolutions are popular up until the point where you give them the change that is to be made into! Then they tend to cool off; don’t you see?

This is a—therefore you find yourself on the lines of world press on the basis of agreement with world press. And if you simply—somebody asks you as a reporter—says, “What do you—what is this Scientology and what does this Scientology stand for?” Well, treat him as a beginning Scientologist not an HPA, and you say, “What do we stand for? We stand for

change. Change to a better existence for man, that's what we stand for" And he'd say, "Dogooders, huh?"

"No, no, we're not really trying to do good, we're just trying to change things."

And if you could hold the fort at that point, and just keep putting out that message, he eventually would become very satisfied that you are all right and you are very newsworthy. You see?

"What change do you propose?" and so forth.

"Well, we think that everything should change!" Just go into big generalities, and so forth. Play it by ear! You don't have to tell him anything. He'd wind up in total agreement with you.

What you haven't had is your minus—zero levels. And that scale, which I'll give you a lecture on one of these days, if I ever get around to it, is actually a scale of awareness, and you've never had that scale before, and you very possibly in looking at it believe you're looking at the old scales, and you're not. You're looking at a brand—new scale, and it's the scale of aware—ness. The scale of what he can be aware of. It's what the person can be aware of or the group can be aware of or the civilization can be aware of. So that is an awareness scale, and that opens the line right up the line to release on study alone. Because it has a trick: If you can locate what a person is aware of on that scale, you only have to tell him about the next level, and he'll become aware of that and experience case change. See, the basic discovery of that is, case improvement by education. That's a brand—new technical thing.

People have sort of believed that might possibly exist. But it isn't executed as shown by the fact that in Johannesburg when we were testing children we found out the further they advanced in school the lower their IQ was. So they must have been educated downhill in some way. So you could practically educate a person uphill or downhill. But that is an awareness scale. And the next time you look at that scale I call it to your attention to wrap your wits around that very carefully, and examine that factor very carefully because you're going to get it confused with conduct.

Now that a person is being hysterical does not put him at the level of hysteria. He's dramatizing hysteria, but what is he aware of? Do you follow? It's what is he aware of? It doesn't show—conduct was the wrong answer. You do not estimate cases by conduct. Only estimate cases by what they can be aware of. And you will have parted company with the psychiatrist and the psychologist, and all the rest of the *-ists* and *-ips* of history. Because that's awareness. And after all, we're dealing with a living thing that can be aware and that is the thing that we can know about a being without any argument at all. And we're dealing with that being's ability to be aware.

Now when we say aware do we mean analytical or reactive? We mean analytically aware. Now that puts people down pretty doggone far. It also makes it a little bit hard to detect. We have this guy flying around and everything he touches turns to disaster. You see, if we were dealing by conduct we would say, "That is disaster. His level is disaster." Nooo, no, no, no! Let's go down, down, from disaster, because obviously disaster is an overwhelm. See, he's dramatizing it, so it must be—a disaster must be higher than he is. Now where below that is he aware? What is he aware of? And we go down several levels and we will run into what the person is aware of. By our experience with the person, it's what he talks about or seems to be alert to.

There are lower levels than minus thirty—four on that gradation scale, by the way, and they are also reachable by the Power Processes which we are using now to release people, but I had to get the scale out. And that's why you see on that particular one that the bottom line, where I have turned the bottom levels sideways and so forth, don't even go to the edge of the paper. That's by design. There are two levels below that, there's—there's reasonableness, and there's false causation. They're two known levels below that. And marvelous!

You take reasonableness—that everything is reasonable. No matter what anybody would say to the bloke it appears to be completely reasonable. That's a well—known phenomenon that we've talked about before. But it's down there below uncausing, and false causation of course is below uncausing. This guy has gotten tired of never having any cause for anything, so he invents them. And can go down scale from there.

But anyway, you'll find—you'll find the human race lying toward the end of that scale. You won't find them toward the top of that scale. In other words the fellow who's aware of being hysterical is probably pretty high—toned. You see, he's a pretty high—toned bloke. But you—how many preclears have you run into that are aware of uncausing? They're aware of causing nothing. Well, how many times have you tried to pull an overt on somebody who says he hasn't done anything? He's never done anything, anyplace, to anybody anywhere. It's impossible to pull an overt because the person is at the level of uncausing, don't you see? There isn't any and he never has!

It's hardly even fate causes anything, it's just—it just happens. That's—we even had a song in the United States not too long ago, "What will be, will be." Not caused by anything, you see. One of the reasons religion has gone out of vogue is they've gone below a perception of God. Wouldn't that be a popular sermon for a church? And isn't it true? I don't know where you would go to get a perception of God. Since by definition he's invisible!

That by the way is the greatest ARC break operation that has ever been pulled in the history of the human race. The God who is everywhere, has no mass, a God of total generality

and total unlocatability—who has total power and total causation. One ARC break coming straight up, thank you! Think it over It's perfectly true!

Well now, this lecture which you're going to get today, starts now! Oh, you think you've had a lecture? Oh, no, they're just some casual comments! I'm going to give you a lecture now, and you better peel your ears back because I do mean—anyone and everyone that happens to hit this one. I'm going to talk to you about ARC breaks and present time problems. And the preamble of this lecture is as follows—I know I gave you no comm bridge between these two, the remarks and the lecture but now the lecture has started. Got it?

Will you please differentiate between ARC breaks and present time problems! Because, please note that about ninety—five percent of the 'ARC broke pcs" (unquote) that you are doing ARC break assessments on are not in an ARC break. They're in a PTP.

Now when you lost sight of that, why you also lost your grip on smooth auditing. Because you can take a pc and say he is ARC broken when he's in PT problem, and you are then in the situation of trying to fix the car when it's the radio that's broken. Worse than that—worse than that, the ARC break is usually after a present time problem unless it is a flagrant case of bypassed charge.

Now let me—let me clarify that, that takes some explaining. What is a present time problem? A present time problem is postulate-counter-postulate. This means, then, that an individual is at wan Don't get the idea of a PTP being something that somebody just worries about, you know, worry, worry, worry, worry, worry. He doesn't! He's agin something. You got it? He's agin it. He isn't sitting there, even though he's worry—worry—worrying, he's still worrying about something he is against, something he doesn't like, something which is counter to his postulates, which causes him to worry, worry, worry, and go into apathy and all that sort of thing.

Now let's examine this very carefully. We have a husband who is having an argument with his wife. One says, "I'm going to go to the movies" and the other says, "You are not going to go to the movies. Well now you're looking at warfare. You're not looking at an ARC break. But very shortly afterwards they will both of them appear to be ARC broken.

Now if you come along as an auditor and you find this girl who just walked off from her husband, looking all sad and weepy, and that sort of thing, and you try to pick up the bypassed charge, well you'd probably find some, which is the fooler, but she wouldn't get any better. You see?



Now if you tried to find on her the problem, she would snap out of it at once. Do you see? “What’s the problem?”

“Well, he wants to go to the movies and I don’t want him to go to the movies.” You follow? ‘And then we had an argument. And then he wouldn’t talk to me.’”

Well now, look at the sequence on the track. ARC break, argument and then breakup of the comm formula. Now you put this person on a meter and you say, “Now has anybody not acknowledged your communication?”

“*Grrow!*”

You say, “Oh, that’s very good, yes, who was that?”

“Well, it was my husband.”

You say, “Oh, fine. Now do you feel all better?”

Why don’t they feel all better? Well, it’s very elementary, that wasn’t what was wrong with them!

Now, if you go around patching up people for broken legs when they’ve got cracked skulls, you’re going to have some case failures. I just wish to call to your attention that this is not the right end to approach the case, don’t you see. If the case has got a fractured skull then you do something about the fractured skull, see? If the case has got a fractured postulate, do something about the fractured postulate, you know? Don’t do something about their bypassed charge. Elementary.

Now, what is the real condition of somebody in a present time problem? ARC broken? No. At wan They’re going to get even! *G—r—r—r!* *Br—r—r—r—r!* See? Postulate-counter-postulate.

When England went to war with Germany, it was because Germany postulated one way and England postulated the other way. And that was a great big problem. Lasted several years, very recently. And there was no auditor around, there was only guns. And nobody took their guns away from them. Do you see?

Now, I assure you it would have done no good to have run Hitler on an ARC break. You would have had to have run him on a PTP. And who knows, if some auditor had been there and run him on a PTP that might not have been the end of the war? Although it probably would have taken a Power Process.

But all right, now let's go back and look at a thing which we had, we call overts. Now why does a person commit overts? There's only one reason a person commits overts (because we now mean intentional overts, not accidentals). You can accidentally drop something on somebody, although you'll usually trace that one back to an intentional, too.

What is an overt? An overt is a solution to a problem.

Now when you define an overt as a solution to a problem, you open up the ordinary, run-of-the-mill, even the very low Level case, wide open to solution. But when you define an overt or a series of overts as an ARC break, you close it to solution.

So I'm tired of seeing you get loses. I'm very tired of seeing you get loses on pcs by this misdiagnosis. I know you have good heart. I know you feel sympathetic. I know that your heart is torn to see somebody standing there weeping because somebody has been mean to them. And you want to help them out. And I know the mildest thing you can say to them is, "Do you have an ARC break?" and the roughest thing to say to them is, "What overt have you committed?" But the resolution of the case is not, "Who has been mean to you?" The resolution of the case is, "Who have you been mean to?" Process the pc at cause, always.

Well now, because it's so impolite to ask them, "What have you done?" and because a case is usually having a very hard time struggling along, trying to get his bearings and so forth—particularly if he's low on levels or something, and can't cause anything and never has, and so forth—this case then is going to have a very rough time trying to answer this question, "Have you committed an overt?" Because he's never committed an overt, because it was all vitally necessary. It's totally justified.

Well let's ask the more penetrating question. And the more penetrating question is, "Why is it so vitally necessary that he commit this overt, and why is it so totally justified?" Well, it is those two things simply because it was a problem which required solution.

Now what throws you is that the problem is on the backtrack someplace, lost in the limbo of God—knows—where, that has in many cases nothing whatsoever to do with present time.

Well, let's take somebody who's been married seven or eight times. Do you know they're probably still solving the problems with their second wife when married to the seventh one. Do you see? And many a person in life, coming up against a marital partner, and finding it completely impossible to understand why this person believes these things and does these things, commits these overts and so forth, doesn't realize that that person is still solving the problems related to an earlier relationship. The problem does not exist in present time. Therefore, the pro—person seems unreasonable. And yet, to that other person, it is a present time problem and can advisedly

be called a present time problem because it is present time for him. Because there hasn't been any present time ever since it happened. That was the last present time he had much to do with. See, he hasn't been with us since.

And a person's overts are solutions to these hung problems. And it's very hard to figure out how having an automobile accident, routinely and regularly, banging up the car as a habit solves any problem. But if you carefully examine the case, you would find out that it solved a very pertinent pressing problem which went back to postulate-counter—postulate. Maybe it's with father Maybe father never let him use a car. So therefore the way to solve this problem, and so forth, is to make a car unusable.

You say, well that's—that's crazy. That's right! You take it back a little further, and you'll find more sensible problems and it actually, if you go very far you will find out that it all makes sense! In a giddy, stupid way, it makes sense. It is not a senseless thing you're going into.

Now let's find some fellow, he's around a plant and we can never discover this boy. You look for him, you page him, you put him on the intercom, you send messengers for him, and so forth, you never seem to be able to catch up with this bird, although he is at work! Well, for the last few lifetimes he has handled the military very effectively by desertion. And the way he handles life is by not being there when he is there. He's still got one solution, see, which is desertion, but actually he's on the job while he has deserted. Do you follow? So he's in a continual missingness. You look for Joe and he's gone. You look for Bill, he's gone, you know? Where is this boy? Where's he disappeared to? Well that was his solution.

Now, it's obviously a solution to getting out of work. So we bawl him out, see, obviously that—so we bawl him out and we say, "It won't do you any good to keep cutting out of here," and so forth, "you've got to work and earn your pay, and you must work..." And then you find out this is somehow very wrong, because somehow he manages to get his work done too. And that doesn't—doesn't remedy the guy. He's still all fouled up. He's still all messed up, as far as you're concerned, even though you told him straight out. Says, "You're just trying to get out of work, that's why you disappear" Well, that was the wrong as—isness. So it wasn't an as—isness and so the question—if you said, "It won't do you any good to desert, you have to go up on the lines, just as you're ordered," he would have sighed deeply and gone into a sort of a frenzy and gone anaten and after that wouldn't have had this.

In other words, if you told him the right problem—this is just hazarding a guess, I'm not giving you a technique because the devil himself could never in—never, never dream up what problem this bird is actually in, don't you see. If you could hit it right on the head, why, bang! That'd be that. And he'd change his conduct right there. Be nothing to changing his conduct, see.

“Oh!” he’d say. You get what you’d call a cognition. “Oh, it isn’t going to do me any good to desert. Oh. Well, I don’t know why I would desert around here, anyhow.” And it’d suddenly look silly to him, you know. ‘And I, furthermore, well look, I haven’t deserted! I’m here!’ And yet that would be the end of this phenomenon of missingness. Do you see?

Now you look on a lot of things as overts which are in actual fact vitally necessary solutions to urgent, immediate problems of survival. The only thing wrong with them is *when*. That’s what makes them look daffy.

Now you could go back and use old Dianetic technology on this line. You could say, “When I snap my fingers the date will flash.” (Don’t bother to have any date flash right now, I’m not auditing you.) “I snap my fingers the date will flash.” See? Bang, there goes the thing. And he says, Five.” You—if you were to have said at that moment or if you said at that moment—this is, you know, the old file clerk, flash response, all right—and “Five.” Five years, you know, bang. Of course it might have been the year Five, too, we’re never sure. And you say, this fellow says, “1932,” or something like that.

“What problem did you have in the year 1932?”

Now, I’ll tell you you’ll get many, many manifestations. But amongst them won’t be disinterest! He is absorbed! You put him right there on the time track where he is solving that problem.

Now, to try to get the major problem that exists on somebody’s time track and so forth, may very well require Power Processes and so forth. This is one of the manifestations which shows up. But it doesn’t require a Power Process for you to become clever at this. Because if a person has some fundamental problem in his life, I don’t care when it was or where it was, it has formed innumerable locks. And those locks have moved on up to PT, and those locks are the overts and the withholds which the person is committing right in present time. So those formed locks are a perfectly legitimate target for an assist, they are perfectly legitimate bait for any auditor in any session. You don’t have to ask for the overts, if you ask for the solutions to the problem. And then if you’re very careful that you got all the solutions to the problem.

So the old process of; “Tell me a problem. And now what solutions have you had to this problem?” By the way, that was a slight misnomer, see, “What solutions have you *had* to this problem?” No, “What solutions did you put into effect to solve this problem?” would have been a closer question, you see. Well that old process was nibbling around the edges of overt-withhold processes. And you actually could work this in such a way as to run O/W on the person by just saying, “Tell me a problem. Now what have you done to solve that problem?” Or, “How have

you attempted to solve that problem?” Or, “What would have solved the problem?” Or, “What action of yours was a solution to the problem?” Do you see what I’m getting at?

Because any action they took to solve the problem was an overt to some degree because it was against another postulate. Do you follow?

So therefore, when you keep sailing in on somebody, asking him for ARC breaks, you’re not talking about what’s wrong with him in the majority of cases. An ARC break is a charge which has been restimulated on the backtrack, which the person hasn’t had move into his total consciousness. It’s just a borderline consciousness, you understand? Now he’s—he’s had an accident. And you come just near enough the accident to clip it against the outer fringes of his consciousness. Now he instantly starts to avoid this accident, and becomes very upset, and a charge has gone into effect on his backtrack which hasn’t been identified. And that is what an ARC break is. An ARC break is bypassed charge. Hasn’t really anything to do with the solutions to problems.

Now, an individual who is failing to complete a communication cycle, because somebody won’t acknowledge it and so forth, only has really the bypassed charge of a missed withhold. It was an inadvertent missed withhold. It’s a very spooky thing to be auditing a pc, and look for overts and withholds, and keep getting a read on a withhold, and the pc starts going around the bend trying to think what this withhold is, only to discover that it is an inadvertent withhold. He didn’t intend to withhold it, just nobody would acknowledge it! He never intended to withhold it at all. Inadvertent withhold.

Now, an inadvertent withhold will cause very near the same phenomena as an actual withhold. Preclear’s sitting there trying to tell his auditor the answer to the question. And the auditor says, “Do birds fly?” and the pc says, “Uh—big birds do,” see. And the auditor keeps asking him, “Well, what sort of birds?” “Well, big birds.” “Well, what sort of birds?” “Big birds.” “What sort of birds?”

All of a sudden the pc (quote) ‘ARC breaks.’ Well, he actually doesn’t ARC break, you have really put into effect the mechanism of a withhold. And so, of course, he gets nasty and nattery and choppy, and so forth. But you call it an ARC break. Do you see? That’s a slight misnomer.

Now, the only reason that it’s an ARC break is you’ve bypassed the charge of his answer. So that much of it is an ARC break. But the better part of it is you’ve given him a problem! He’s now trying to solve it. He’s being told to answer the question and he is not being permitted to. Which is again a question versus an answer, or a postulate counter a postulate, which won’t

resolve, so it sets up in counter-opposition, and that is a problem. If you get a pc who's been chopped up, and so forth, by not having his answers acknowledged or accepted by the auditor and so on, it's very interesting that it will solve quite rapidly by asking him about what problem he has had in auditing. He'll give you this problem and that problem and the other problem and so forth, and all of a sudden. "Well, the problem of getting somebody to listen to me!" And that will be the end of that problem. Do you follow?

Now if you wanted to get his overts against auditors, you would say then, "Then *how* did you go about solving it?" and he gives you a whole string of overts which previously had been completely out of sight. Well, he comes to session late, don't you see, he reports auditors to supervisors, he—you see, when they haven't done anything. You see, he could go on and on and on and he'd give you a whole bunch of these little overts, don't you see. Do you see how this put—together goes?

Now you could easily be misled, because there is a bypassed charge there, immediately in the session, which does respond to some degree to an ARC break phenomena. So you say he must have an ARC break. Oh, yes, he also has an ARC break, but that ARC break doesn't happen to be clean—up—able. It would be pretty hard to clean up that ARC break as a surface manifestation because it doesn't have anything to do with the problem. He only had an ARC break because he had a problem. Now if you were to clean up the problem and the problems he had had in relationship to his auditing, why, a whole string of ARC breaks will blow—so—called! See? You get rid of a lot of them and also a whole string of overts.

So the way to approach it was not by finding out this little tiny piece of bypassed charge that occurred in the session. The way to knock this thing apart was to find out that colossal number of problems he has had about auditing. Do you follow? "What problem have you had with me about auditing?"

"Well, very often you didn't seem to listen to me." See?

"Well, how did you handle this?"

"Well, I stopped telling you right answers."

Now the reason this is solvable is that problems and awareness of problems, is down below minus thirty—four. Problems is way south. And cause is way north. So of course, you try to pull problems directly with O/W, the pc would have to already be so high—toned they wouldn't have any effect on him if you did pull them. But you can discuss problems with most everybody. If you go into a spinbin, and just stop the first person you meet and say, "Do you have a problem?" Oh—ho—oh, brother, does he have a problem! But he's liable not to tell you

about it because you'll order him to being electric shocked or something. Yeah, he's got problems. People seem to understand this, way down south. It seems to be on the basis that where there is life there is a problem.

So, your proper approach in making your pcs smooth, in making the life of your fellow Scientologists run like a well-oiled dream with auditing, is the approach through finding out what's the postulate-counter—postulate situation, when a pc feels all—or looks—all downgraded or upset, and attack it from that quarter. And you suddenly will have the magical result of somebody coming up shining!

Now, this does not say there isn't such a thing as a pres—as a bypassed charge, and an ARC break. Brother! If you want to see a good, nice, healthy ARC break, just throw an end word or something into restim on somebody that he is not aware of; and here is this total, howling generality in full play, back down his track but outside of his zone of awareness. And brother, he will ARC break! And now you really see an ARC break! Do you see? Here you've got this total generality. Because the whole bank is a total generality. Which is the most total generality that one can state, that is still true.

Oh, yes, there is such a thing as an ARC break. Very, very definitely. His affinity, reality and communication go right by the boards because he cannot locate the source of He cannot locate where this horrible feeling is coming from. He cannot identify the threat. And he goes z—z—z—z—z—z—z! He feels terrible. It isn't because he's sick at his stomach, it's because he doesn't know what's making him sick at his stomach. (Somebody get a broom and knock that down, would you?) See, it isn't that he is feeling terror, or something like this, it's because he hasn't a clue what's making him feel terror You inadvertently list a series of end words or goals on somebody and then abandon the right one. In other words, he didn't notice that on the list, don't you see. He put the list down, and then you go right over the right one and you give him a wrong one. Well at that moment you're going to have a lovely ARC break. His affinity is going to drop, his reality is going to drop, his communication level is going to go to pot and it will happen on such a steep curve it looks like a Stuka dive bomber ARC breaks be darned, it's an ARC smash, you see.

Now his understanding of the situation will go completely by the boards at that exact second, and in R6 you can see a person go from about Tone 40 to about Tone Minus 40 in the flash of an eye, if you goof on a bypassed charge because this total generality, he knows not what of now, has got him in a total grip. And he's spooked! And he goes, "What happened?" see? "*Rroaw!*" And instantaneously becomes rather irrational about the whole thing and so forth. Now you—if you've ever seen that one happen, that's a real ARC break. But this business about

some Instructor bawls somebody out, and he now has an ARC break. Oh, b—! He hasn't got an ARC break, he's got a problem! Instructor thought one thing, he thought the other thing.

Now what goes into view here, he's probably got a little series of overts against this Instructor too, and at that moment he contemplates a few more!

Now some student grabs ahold of him and gives him an ARC break assessment. And nothing happens. Nothing happens at all. Well, of course nothing's going to happen because you aren't running the right process, see. You're fixing the piano leg when it's the sofa pillow. And you know, it's just the funniest thing in the world, you're going to repair all the pianos in the world without fixing any piano stools. If you go around and make a habit of addressing the wrong item to repair, consistently and continually, people will get an idea that you're a pretty poor mechanic! And you'll get an idea you're a pretty poor mechanic, too, if you keep repairing sofas and then go over and play the piano to see if it plays any better but it doesn't play any better and you come back over and repair the sofa some more in order to see if the piano plays any better but the piano doesn't play any better You can keep that up for hundreds of years. I know nobody would do that.

But in the field of auditing, remember we are dealing with things which are not visible to the naked eye. You have to know about them and you come to know about them by experience and subjective reality. And so your subjective reality on the thing will tell you this is true when you've had it happen to you a few times.

The trouble with ARC break assessments is they very often give an auditor a win. And he gets stuck in a win. And this is very often a fateful thing to happen to somebody. He's got such terrific sudden relief on the pc when he did an ARC break assessment you see, that he says, "boy!" and he's still hunting to do that. So he does it on the people with present time problems, too. And he doesn't get any wins on those, so he begins to wonder where is this win. He begins to feel around like the guy who needs spectacles but can't find his glasses, see? "Where is this thing?" you know? "It must be around here someplace." "Well, we'll do some more ARC break assessments," and it—just nothing happens. Well, he just happened to get the fellow who—that had an end word in restimulation or a piece of the reactive mind in restimulation, and just happened to knock the thing out, don't you see? Accidentally knocked it out.

I mean, if we're doing something very innocent like an ARC break assessment on Level Zero, see, well, they had bypassed charge, the fellow had an engram or a secondary or a GPM or something key in on him, you see, and it caused an ARC break and then we did an assessment and we picked up the key in. The exact—the exact key—in, the moment of it, which keyed it out, don't you see? Boy, it's one of these things, it's like throwing—it's like this stuff they play on



the stage here on the London Palladium, the—throwing some of those balls into the circular holes, and so forth, trying to match something up, you know. And the hole is—the hole is the wrong shape and tipped the wrong way, don't you see. Like at a carnival. Did you ever go to a carnival and waste your money trying to throw rings on canes? And did you ever notice that the canes are placed just so that no ring fits on any of them? But that sometimes over at the side the one that you're supposed to be able to get, that will catch it. That's the one in a thousand, don't you see?

But you could get that exact instant when you had a key—in of a heavy bypassed charge, key that out, and get this fantastic resurgence on your pc. And you say, “Boy, these ARC break assessments, boy, they're the most!” And you go around then, for the next year, trying to find your glasses! “What happened?” you see, and “I must be a bad auditor and I should have to study a great deal more so that I can learn how to do this.” Well, what you haven't learned how to do is run a problem.

Now, for a person who is in the world of livingness you find out that running problems is much the safer bet. And if you were to bet on these two things one for one, you see, if you were to bet on them, the thing to put the bet on is the problem because that would occur far more often. You'd still miss, occasionally, because the fellow really was in an ARC break. You see, it was bypassed charge from that bank got in and the moment of key—in, if contacted, would pass out, don't you see? But it will also pass out if you handle a problem. Don't you see?

So these light session ARC breaks that you get on a Grade I,II,III pc and so on, they're actually most—most uniformly handleable on the basis of problem. You save your ARC break ability and so forth for when you really need it, because there is no problem of any kind whatsoever would ever touch a GPM. That would have to be *the* charge, you would have to find out, was it an end word, was it a GPM, was it an item, was it a this, was it a that? Have we thrown an RI in restimulation? Because of course that's so overwhelmingly huge in its ability to overwhelm the pc that he isn't aware of that being a problem at all. That's just a total overwhelm.

It's like saying, “Do you have a problem with internal revenue?” Well, you couldn't possibly have a problem of internal revenue, they just throw you in jail! So you could call that a sort of an ARC break. You get the idea? You get where the borderline switch occurs here, you see? When a guy is so overwhelmed, and the charge is so tremendous, and so on, that—well, you have to key out that thing, but then that thing is easily spotted, if you know what it is.

Then this tells you of course that a person occasionally can go around in an ARC break that you couldn't touch at lower levels. And that's perfectly correct. Because most people low on the Tone Scale are in a continuous ARC break with existence. And the way to handle that ARC break with existence is to handle their problems and find out what little continuing overts they

have to do all the time, all the time, all the time, all the time, in order to keep even with existence. And if you did that you would very rapidly achieve a state of un-ARC-brokenness, apparently, until the next ARC break. Do you see?

ARC break is a manifestation of a lowering of affinity, reality and communication. It's just that manifestation. If this has occurred when you're doing R6 auditing, if this occurs along that line someplace, ah well, you haven't any choice but to go down and get that item. Once in a while you can do a session ARC break assessment when your pc is very ARC broken. You will hit the exact instant when you keyed something in. But if you think that it was something that happened in the session that caused the ARC break, you're very badly mistaken. The session inadvertently brought into view someplace on the backtrack something which was not acknowledged. A heavy charge on the backtrack moved in, just to the fringes of consciousness of this pc. And he reacted. And his affinity, reality and communication went by the boards.

Now if you were to do this little session ARC break assessment, and one of them "bings," like "I didn't acknowledge your question," you can say, "I didn't acknowledge your question," and this thing will go back and lie down and be a good dog, see? That doesn't mean it won't key in again tomorrow.

Now, there's something else that must have it keyed in, too. It must be that he's already in a postulate-counter—postulate situation, in order to be pulling bank in on himself like that.

Now, here's an old thing that I don't particularly think that you ought to experiment with, just for the fun of experimenting with it. But if you think of yourself as expendable someday, well just try it. This is an experimental process. I underscore, it is experimental and is not therapeutic in any way, shape or form. But it is highly educational. Run on somebody or yourself; the process, invent a problem." And after a while you're going to see some black masses start showing up in your vicinity.

Now, this isn't because you are pulling in backtrack. This is because you're really collapsing your bank. So, you invent a problem and you invent another problem. You'll see—if you're lucky in this experiment; this is the usual result—you'll see a mass moving in on you, and you invent another problem it'll move another two feet closer to you, you invent another problem and it'll move another two feet closer to you, see.

Now, if you keep doing this and if all of the problems you invented were brand—new problems, which had nothing to do on the backtrack, why you'd eventually get in a ball.

Now, also, if you invented a solution, invented a solution, invented a solution, invented a solution, and if they were all invented solutions, you similarly would get the mass moving in on

you. But if you accidentally, as you normally would do, gave a problem which was on your backtrack, if you thought of a problem, and thought of a problem, and thought of a problem, and thought of a problem, and thought of a problem, the problem would move away from you. Have you got this, now? In other words you're getting less problems.

You'll see that black mass in the mind moving out because you're running old problems, really. Thought of a problem, thought of a problem, thought of a problem.

Now, if you want to see it move back in, invent a solution to it. See, there'll be some kind of a representative mass. Now, invent a solution. Make sure you invent a solution. Something that you could do right now in present time to solve that situation. "Well I could hit it." "Well I could as—is it." "I could run flows on it." Don't you see? And you'll see that thing coming closer and closer, and closer and closer

In other words, any inventedness, totally new inventedness—this is the trick—has a tendency to collapse the bank. Totally new inventedness, whether problems or solutions. But if you started knocking out a bunch of whole track problems, you would find the problems going away from you. If you started knocking out a bunch of whole track solutions you would find the mass going away from you, too. Well, why the near—far? And that's all I'm trying to teach you here. You can play this eighteen ways from the middle. It's very interesting to see a mass, and you just invent another—you answer the question again, see. And it's closer, see. And then, bang, you answer the question again, and this thing is closer How come it's closer? Where is it coming from? How come? See? And you do an as—isness on the subject and it moves away. It's quite amusing. You'll see this thing move.

Eventually, if you go on, and get problem of comparable magnitude, problem of comparable magnitude, something like that, why, it may not move away or it may move up. It just depends on whether or not you're as—ising problems, you see, or inventing them. But, you normally would see it move out because it's almost impossible to invent a new problem you haven't had. So, it—you'd see this thing go out, out, out—you'd finally say, "Well it's out there a couple of; couple of light—years! That's a long way away, I can't even see it anymore." You'd say, "All right, good. Now solve it. Thank you. Solve it. Solve it. Solve it. Solve it."

"Wait a minute, it came back!"

"Good. Solve it some more. Solve it again."

"Hey!"

Now, if you really wanted to be real mean to somebody, why just say, “Well, solve it.” And he’d say, “Well it’s about five feet away,” he’d say very cheerfully, and you say, ‘All right. Dream up another solution to that.’”

“*Erk?*’

“Dream up another solution to it.”

“Well, wait a minute! It’s right up against my face now!”

“Good. Dream up another solution to it.”

“Ow!”

See? He starts feeling crushed. If it’s a psychiatrist leave him that way. If it’s a Scientologist, why pick up some of the things you’ve been doing and move it out again. (You didn’t get that joke.) Probably too bedazzled with this experiment. You understand this experiment?

In other words you can move mass in and out on the basis that you get rid of problems, or get rid of solutions, or invent problems or invent solutions. Do you understand?

Now the usual thing is to put up the representation or experiment in this way. Run a problem of comparable magnitude: “Think of a problem of comparable magnitude, think of a problem of comparable magnitude, think of a problem of comparable magnitude,” and you’ll see that mass moving out, out, out, out, out, out, out, you see. And then you’ll say, “Think up a solution. Think up a solution. Think up a solution.” And you’ll see it come in, in, in, in, in, in, in. You got the idea?

But the main message here is that you can move mental masses around with the idea of problems and the idea of solutions. Why? Well, it’s a basic definition of problems and solutions.

A solution is an effort to bat it away, which normally fails, and it’s a postulate-counter—postulate to begin with. So just the thought of a problem will find the opposite postulate across from you in a hurry.

This basically proves the definition of postulate-counter—postulate. Now, how does this fellow get that mass away from him? He feels—you see, this is happening to him in livingness, it isn’t just an experiment which I’m giving you which you could run. This happens to this bird! He has a problem and life sort of moves in on him. How’s he going to get rid of that? Well, his effort is one to bat it. To push at it. To *do* something to it. What’s it? The problem. Well, how come he calls it “it”? Well, because it’s represented as a mass to him. Because it is a mental mass. Because if he kept on getting this problem it would squash his face in! Postulate-counter—postulate.

On the backtrack every time you had a fight with another thetan, why, he hit you with a beam and you hit him with one, don't you see? So people have this trained in as quite a mechanism, here. One of the oldest mechanisms there is. Postulate-counter—postulate.

So whether he sees it or not, when he has a problem show up he gets a mass show up. And whether he realizes it or not, the thing he tries to do about it is to do something about it to move it away from him. But his effort to move it away from him will move it closer to him. So he's in a situation when he has a problem that he has to do something about something, in order to get rid of the something which is moving in on him. Do you follow that?

If you don't, you're just trying to overread too much into it. If a guy has a problem he's usually got what the problem is.

Now, sometimes you can have a problem with missingness. It isn't there and there's nothing to confront. A problem of missingness. That is the problem of "where is it?" which goes into a rather total generality and at this moment your problem fringes on the basis of an ARC break. And that's why they appear to be cousins.

So the "It's gone" as a situation, and "Where do I find it?" and "Where can I look for it?" and "Where can I get another one?" In other words, problems of this character, you see, are borderline to the ARC break. In other words, the nothing—thereness will come into a close cousin to the generality of an ARC break, do you follow? He can't locate it or find it and so forth. Do you see? So they come a cousin, so it's very easy for you to make a mistake between them and I don't blame you for making a mistake between them.

But I should have thought by now that failures to solve ARC breaks would have pointed out to you that there must have been something else wrong with the pc. Because you have quite routine failures in handling ARC breaks. Somebody's turned over to you to run an ARC break on. Well, right away, that is the wrong thing to do. Is to tell somebody to take somebody to run an ARC break on them. The diagnosis has already been made. And it is a misdiagnosis.

Some student is nattery, and choppy and upset about something or other, so somebody's liable to come along and say, "All right, do an ARC break assessment on that student." See? Well now that would be a completely improper direction. As a matter of fact it comes under the heading of job and reputation endangerment, because you very well may have been set up! A problem that can't be solved because it is a problem, not an ARC break, you see?

Somebody has told you to run an ARC break assessment, when as a matter of sober fact they should have told you, "Straighten up that student!" Do you follow? And then what you ought to do—what you ought to do when you find something like this is to ask the person if they

have a problem. And you'll get rid of it ten times as fast as anything else, on every process except R6. On R6 you see somebody all caved—in and chopped up you jolly well better get your bypassed charge list for R6. You better break it out and go down the line. Because that's the problem. It's again a problem of what's there which is impinging on the consciousness, don't you see, but nothing under the sun will ever find it but an R6 assessment.

You see all these other things are just locks on the reactive bank. And that is the reactive bank. There is no other It maybe never has occurred to you that there's no other reactive bank than that. A fellow just doesn't go on making a reactive bank unless he's under an awful compulsion to do so. And the basic one of the—fifty percent of the reactive bank is devoted to a compulsion to make a reactive bank! Do you follow?

So, if you're running R6 or something like that, and your boy gets into trouble, and so on, well there's nothing you can do about him but find the bypassed charge.

On lower levels, why, ARC break, oh I don't know, I would finally occasionally use an ARC break assessment on some pc. Particularly if I'd known I'd goofed. If I'd catch myself going by, and so forth, and realized I hadn't acknowledged the pc and the pc was getting rather urgent, I'd realize I'd failed to acknowledge the pc and I'd key it out right away quick. I'd say "Have I failed to answer an auditing—have I failed to acknowledge an answer you've given me?"

"Yes, you did."

"Well, when was that? All right, I failed to acknowledge an answer." And the pc'd cheer up and the session would go forward, don't you see? That type of ARC break assessment, you see?

Well, I'm afraid I wouldn't sit down with a long list, and go on for two or three hours of assessment by elimination, unless I were doing Auditing by List. You could probably get somewhere with that. That old Auditing by List is kind of interesting. "In life has anybody failed to acknowledge you?" You know? You'd get some answers to that question! Quite an interesting theory, don't you see?

But normally, normally, you see somebody who is nattery, chopped up, unhappy with their auditing, unhappy with you, unhappy, well, just handle it as a problem and it'll blow away. Don't foist off a problem on them if they don't have one. But you actually will not find an individual who is choppy or upset who doesn't have a problem. They go together like Pat and Mike in the old jokes. They're side by side. This guy's going, "Ohhh, I don't want you to audit me anymore, I—noo—no—no—nooooo.. ." Well it isn't advisable to say, "What overt have you committed against me?" Nor is it advisable to say because he—it wouldn't be there if he knew,

“What engram are you dramatizing?” See, these are perfectly correct questions if they were answerable. But they don’t happen to be answerable, you see?

Sure enough, he’s dramatizing some engram. These things are perfectly true. But the question is how can it be approached? Well, the way it can be approached is, “Have you got a problem?”

“Oh, boy, have I got a problem!”

You get an almost bang—bang answer, see?

“Oh, I’m so ARC broken. I’m just so ARC broken.”

“Good. What problem do you have?”

“Oh, problem! Well, I got just tons of problems,” and you’ll find the person’ll pick right up. ARC break assessment can be as idiotic as—you don’t even take them and put them on a meter—you say, “Have you got a problem?”

“Oh, yeah.”

“Whatcha doing about it?”

Hmm, you see an insane glee come in some peoples’ eyes!

You understand what I’m trying to tell you, here? I’m trying to tell you that you don’t have overts in the absence of a problem. People do not commit overts for nothing. When they commit overts they are solutions to the problem. The problem may be daffy, the problem may not have been in existence for the last trillennia, but it is still a real problem—to them! And their overts are efforts to solve that problem. And that you could unburden their case very easily by finding, well, problems and solutions. Run almost in any way of the hundreds and hundreds of different ways I know of to handle problems.

“What part of that problem could you be responsible for? Thank you very much. What part of that problem could you be responsible for? What part of that problem could you be responsible for?”

“Tell me a problem of comparable magnitude. How do you solve that problem?”

In other words you could go on, and on and on and on and on.

You got the idea? I mean there’s just dozens of them. They’re perfectly mechanical. See, they require no insight of any kind whatsoever

“Do you have a problem?”

The guy says “Uh—huh.”

“What part of the probl—” he hasn’t even told you what it is! And you’ll be tremendously *successful* in picking somebody’s tone up, don’t you see? You don’t have to know anything, you don’t have to do anything! You don’t have to be clever, you don’t have to even read the meter!

So I want to know why you’re working at it when you do. What’s the sweat? It’s just too easy.

You’ll find out that if in—some person has a tremendously fundamental problem in life. You ask them for a problem, and you say, ‘All right, was that your problem?’

“No, really the problem was something else. The problem was so—and—so and so—and—so.”

And you say, ‘All right, is that your problem?’ And they’ll say, “No, my problem is really...” They deny each problem as they as—is it! And they keep coming up and they keep giving you these problems, and giving you these problems, well what’s happening here? They’re as—ising the problems! And they of course are getting down to the main problem. They can keep this up for a long time, too. This individual can tell you, “Oh, yes, I have a problem!”

Well, don’t think you’ve arrived anyplace when he’s told you, because you’ve just got the one on top. How about the five hundred and eighty—five thousand nine hundred and sixty—nine trillion that lie below it? They’re all locks on some fundamental problem. This guy was still trying to get out of a pyramid in local—in lower Upglop. See, something is happening, somewhere on his track. And he just keeps adding stuff on top of it and he will articulate this.

The basic mechanism of the mind—the basic mechanism of the mind is that it needs a problem situation to lock up time. You mustn’t forget that. If a person is locked up anyplace, or is out of present time, it must be because of a problem. There isn’t anything else can stop him on the time track but a problem.

Haven’t you noticed that all the stories that appear in your color magazines every Sunday and on TV and so forth, and we are looking at a journalism which is apparently stuck in World War II! They fight World War II every few months, here! Well why?

Well, because there was a postulate-counter—postulate, and it was all pulled together with a whole bunch of solutions, and there it is, tied up on the time track. And the civilization to a marked degree has not moved off that point of the time track. So that if you opened a cabaret up in London which consisted of a deep cellar with a lot of arrows pointing, and your hostesses were



all wearing air—raid wardeness' uniforms and hats and so forth, and what people did was go in there and sit down on the floor and it was sort of dim, you would probably, if you charged fifty bob for entrance to the place you'd probably make a fortune as it's an air—raid shelter people could go to!

You'll find any point of the time track where a civilization is stuck, why they will buy that period as more real than any new period or creation which you could give them.

Now, similarly, you want to know how to get your pc's attention, if your pc doesn't seem to be giving you very, very close attention, well, you can immediately assume that the pc is locked up someplace in the back—in back time. And if you want to get his attention you have to enter that back time period from your time period, and the way to do that is to trigger the back time period. And you instantly have his attention because you're right there with him. Obviously you're saying to him, "Do you have a problem?"

"Oh, yes! Yes!"

"What?"

"Somebody else here! Hadn't somebody been here for years!"

"Very good!"

"Yes, I've got a problem! My problem's so—and—so and so on. Well, those two saber—toothed tigers, they're sitting over in the corner, that's a hell of a problem I'm sitting here with."

You'll find him very glib. He'll answer up right now! You very seldom, even on a very daffy person, find there's much comm lag in giving you a problem. Because you've entered that point of the time stream where they are. They're stuck.

Now, all you'd have to do would be to release in a huge mailing, "Tell me your problem." You'd get an awful lot of mail! That is the auditing question.

So therefore, why anybody would go around asking people if they had ARC breaks, and losing, when all they have to do is ask them if they have problems, and win—well, that's it. I wouldn't even bother to give you a process to run problems today. I can—there's just been too many of them. All of them effective. Every one of them had some effectiveness. Even old mock—up processing had effectiveness. God forbid, knowing the reactive bank, now!

Now, if you're trying to get overts off, so you say, "Well, I know he's got overts. I know he's got overts. I know he's got..." Well, you could say that about anybody, you see, and, it's perfectly true, but how do you make it stick? Well, you can't go up to a person at uncausing and

say, “Do you have an overt?” But you can go to that person and say, “Do you have a problem?” and “What are you doing to solve it?” And he’d give you his overts.

Now, to get him to realize they’re overts is of course quite impossible, because they’re necessary solutions! You got it?

Well, you see, I did have a lecture to tell you about today, didn’t I? And what I was talking to you about was all froth, wasn’t it? But the lecture wasn’t. But I hope you can use this. I hope you can use it. I hope you can press it to your bosom the next time you see some pc looking all *durrh*. Restrain this feeling of saying, “You poor fellow, who has done you in?” and just say, “What’s your problem?”

“Oh, well, *br—r—r—r—r—*”

You’ve got him in communication. You’ve got him answering up the auditing question and all you have to do is remember now to acknowledge, and so forth, and don’t give them a further problem of finding out they’re talking but not to anybody.

All right, well, I hope you can use that. I’ve lately—actually don’t think that you’re just being stupid, because you’ve missed this in Scientology. Any technology has alongside of it a channel of communication. It is how things can be phrased, how they could be communicated. This in actual fact—somebody might have—may have known some of these principles someplace on the track, but he never communicated them. So the communication is the better part of the thing because only when communicated is it of use. And, I have found recently by experience with cases how to communicate this to you so that you could understand it. And I trust I have done so.

Thank you very much!