

THE WELL-ROUNDED AUDITOR

A lecture given on
29 June 1965

Thank you. Well, thank you.

Female voice: There's something I want to give you before we begin.

There's something here. *All* right. What's this? Oh! Oh, yes, this is – thank you, thank you very much. This is a Declaration of Release to L. Ron Hubbard. It says, “L. Ron Hubbard is hereby certified as having attained the State of First, Second and Third Stage Release in accordance with the Hubbard Communication Office requirements. Signed, Department of Certificates and Awards.”

Well, I was on Power Processing all this time without wearing one of those little signs. You see, the red “R” now, makes it possible for you to ask questions. I can't guarantee what state you'll arrive at after you've asked the questions but there it is.

This – by the way, this might interest you. I've forgotten the exact date, but Mary Sue audited me to a First Stage – what they get in the earlier lower-level processes and so forth – audited me to that I think back in 1963.

Female voice: February 24th.

February 24th, 1963 and the needle went free and nothing would answer up and so forth. And we were going for broke on the thing, and we went ahead and did some other auditing and so forth, and actually I hit Keyed-Out OT at that particular time. Then as a labor of love, why, I went around and did a lot more research and a lot more work on the general situation and plowed myself in good and heavy because the bank was completely unknown at that time – the actual R6 bank – and I went ahead and floundered around in it and fell on my head and picked myself out of it and went back into it and pulled myself out of it and a few things like that.

When the Power Processes came out – I had to develop these processes – and after they were developed it was an oddity here that the Power Processes actually are totally predicted. They were not developed empirically. One of the first pieces of data we have ever had that was *totally* developed, 100 percent, without a single address to a single case or anything else. They

were just—figured them out and there they should be and they were there. And we've been running them that way ever since. And the only place we get into any trouble and so forth is when we depart from that original, which was interesting.

But I got to thinking about that after a while and I said, "Well, this is pretty rough go and if I'm going to do a lot of case supervision and write up a lot of material on this, why, I jolly well had better have a better subjective reality on this than I have." So I rolled up my sleeves and I ran the Power Processes on Solo and ran them all the way through to the end and the proper end result and so forth. Well, oddly enough when I got to the end result, all that was sitting there for a "reviv" on the final engram and that sort of thing was just the beginning of track and the entrance to this universe and the R6 bank. I found out I was trying to buck this thing with a Power Process. So I'd wound up in the wrong spot. So I backed off a little bit and that was it. And that was what we'll know now as a Second Stage Release.

Then I said, 'All right. There are other people going to do this. If you run into the bank, and that sort of thing, you should be able to play tag with the R6 bank and go into it and drive the tone arm up and not walk around with this terrible liability of throwing the pc into the bank and maybe not getting them back out of it again. So there must be another set of processes.' So I worked very hard, extrapolated these processes, figured those things out and we got a Third Stage Release which is selective ability. You can just call your shots on what ability you want back and so forth and you can work it out with a Third Stage Release. And we got three more new Power Processes.

So a Third Stage Release would be somebody who had selective ability. Now, the funny part of it is that a Third Stage Release meets and shakes hands with R6EW and you can throw yourself back into the bank on a Third Stage Release. You can again run that too far, but sitting, greeting you at this particular time all you get is the basic reactive bank. But you're now at the correct end of it and it will start to disintegrate whether you know its pattern or not. But if you try to go very far without knowing its pattern, there are so many tricks in it and that sort of thing, you'll quickly snarl up. But a Third Stage Release can push himself into and pull himself out of the R6 bank at will.

So this makes a pretty well—mapped route at this particular time, and it's very interesting that the goal that we've sought actually for fifteen years, what we've been trying to do and so on, had just dropped out of a slot with this ease.

We're now getting an interesting reaction in organizations around: "Why is somebody sending a Class VII Auditor here to release us by Power Processing? We're releasing all the people we want to release on Level 0 and I and II. *Hmm, hmm, hmm?*' Well actually, after they've

released somebody on 0, I and II, they have made a First Stage Release. And the difference amongst these Releases is simply stability—the degree of stability; how long does this state last, and so on. The states aren't necessarily higher one way or the other—only they really are, but you don't—you neglect that. It's mainly stability.

And a First Stage Release very often got us into trouble on the subject of Clear Every once in a while we'd get clearing in trouble because, you see, at one time we called that a Clear and that was as close as we were to clearing. Clearing is on the other side of the R6 bank, we know now. But all the manifestations of it can occur

Well, there's the basic manifestations of it can occur—the needle phenomenon and so forth—so, it's a Keyed—Out Clear, you see. But a Keyed—Out Clear made with 0, I, II, III, IV, and so forth, may be Clear as a bell for five minutes, five days, five months, five years or five hundred years. You just pays your money and takes your chance. The fellow has been brought up to a point where he can postulate and all he has to do is postulate one postulate wrong way to and the R6 bank rears up and hits him in the teeth, and he's no longer a Release. So it's very unstable, don't you see. Highly unstable. Completely changes somebody's life and so forth, and actually that is *Homo novis*, but how long does he stay there?

Now, on the Power Process, and so forth, Release there is no—is no kickback. You can feel bad and you can feel wowsy and you can feel this and that and so forth, and your needle can go a bit off and so on, but you don't lose any of those things. You don't lose any of the capabilities that you've run into. You see, the degree of stability is quite great.

Now, you proceed on from there. There is no known technology for the creation of a Keyed—Out OT. We can't call one of those at will, but when I notice we can't do one of these things at will, why, give us a week. But it's something—it's something that happens unpredictably. You may be going for a Power Process Release and find yourself with a Keyed—Out OT on your paws. And this is quite interesting. I wouldn't even attempt to describe a Keyed—Out OT. It's rather fabulous. But the degree of stability there is merely because it keyed out. It can key back in again. But it's liable to stay out and squared around for quite a while if you don't fool with it too much.

The net gain we've gotten out of all of this is we have actually, then, cleared by the definitions of *Dianetics: The Modern Science of Mental Health*, a great many people. And then by going on auditing them afterwards on ordinary processes, we have just shot them to bits. And it's very hard on them to do this.

The only thing that a First Stage Release of that type we were making—auditors wouldn't know what a floating needle was. They'd see the fellow reading at Clear read and the needle would be floating and so on, and they just kept on running the process, you know. And the pc wouldn't know about it. He would know there was this point in some session somewhere where he felt wonderful. And he never saw the meter at that time and neither did the auditor.

And then after that he'd get ARC breaky in processing, and he'd find out processing was very hard to do and that he didn't really want to be processed and it was upsetting to him. Well, the only thing that could have been run on him then were the Power Processes, you see. And he could have been run on the Power Processes and brought to a higher degree of stability in the field of Release.

But if you were to overrun the Power Processes and if you were to pro—audit somebody now on ordinary processes who had been power processed, then you would be in trouble. Because there's only one thing there to hack at and that's the R6 bank, really. But you could come back and isolate some selective abilities with these other processes and move him on up to the Third Stage by selective abilities, playing tag all the time with the R6 bank and eventually all there is left is your R6 materials.

It's very interesting and I should tell you by the way—not to go on with this endlessly—but I should tell you that it is highly probable that you will not make Clear unless you've been Power Process released. The route right straight through the bank when it lies across an engram that will revivify, and so forth, is too hard. It is too rough. Because you've got—you've got an engram sitting there and you're sitting in the engram and you're trying to run the R6 bank while you're sitting in an engram. You're not, then, in possession of all of your facilities with which to run it and you'll find out the R6 bank isn't as—ising properly. And that was the only trouble with it and so forth.

So if you've had dreams of just going right straight through to Clear without ever being a Release, why, you might as well come off of it because... That's all right; you and a lot of others will learn how to do Class VII before you're through, so... It isn't too hard to do. But that's the easiest and safest way. And then you find out R6 materials, they just run like a bomb. My God! There's nothing to it because you're just right straight at it and everything as—isises like mad.

It is an interesting put—together The—also it is quite fascinating to watch raw meat that is power processed. This is fascinating because they don't know where the hell they've wound up at. They have no inkling of that R6 bank there. They don't know what wall they're going to beat their head against, don't you see? And they don't know why an overrun made them feel so weird. And then you fish them out and they feel terrific, don't you see? They're fine, but they're

not auditors, you see, so they don't know what's happening. It tends—they feel wonderful and full of awe.

So your best route—your best route is Power Processes and R6 study and so forth to Clear. That is easily the best route through. Don't worry about it. You'll make it anyhow. You could probably—there'll be some small minority that will be able to make it directly and so forth. Only don't expect me to be around and hold your hand after I've told you the horrible truth. The horrible truth is that you try to run GPMs and end words while you're sitting in an engram that should have been run by Power Processing and you get somatics and things that you can't account for There you are at the battle of the Marne being shot full of bullet holes while trying to run the R6 bank. The two things don't agree.

All right. Very good. This is the 29th of June 1965, AD 15.

All right. Well, I probably should give you a lecture today on something interesting, but I forgot my notes and I don't have the reciprocal formula of the Latitudinal Bomb Festival, so I can't give you any lecture on that subject.

Now, the truth of the matter is we're advancing very, very fast today organizationally. The technical advances we're making unfortunately are out of the—this world as far as general release is concerned. Somebody sends an R6 set of materials through the despatch lines and I've got a clerk who is dead sick and can't account for it. You get the idea. Somebody hears the commands of the Power Processes and so on and decides to run them on a pc, or himself lying in bed at night, and a student doesn't appear for the next day for class, you see.

In other words, we're dealing—we're dealing with materials that look very elementary. They look very simple. Nothing looks simpler than the Power Processes. The hardest thing to teach about the Power Processes is that they are done just exactly as they are done and they aren't done any other way. And most of the instruction is just getting the few simple data in there well enough so all the other confusion blows off

Here and there in the auditors on staff and so on you'd never see such confusion arrive in—arise in your life, and what they're re—occasionally on some little point, and the confusion just starts going off because the datum is too simple. It's too fundamental, don't you see?

The way to run the Power Processes is you just run each one to its exact expected end result. And how do you run them? You run them muzzled. And what do you do if something goes wrong? You send the pc to Review. And what if the pc finds out it's an ethics—type case you're trying to run? Then Review sends him to Ethics to get him cleaned up with the environment. And it's just all *da—da—da—da, da—da—da—da*, you know? And really, it's trying to teach

somebody how to do a very, very simple step when they're used to doing adagio or something, you see. And they think—they think what's being required of them is the adagio whi—adagio while standing on their heads on the back of an elephant that is galloping. And actually you're asking them to stand on one spot and say the word "one" several times. And they say, "Well, do you say it in a high—pitched voice or a low—pitched voice?"

Now, I'm running up against—I haven't exhausted the materials of study by a long ways. And there's just so much data one hasn't got much chance to write it all up and put it in a condensed and put—together form. That will happen too. But—well, now that I'm released, you can expect things to be better

But it's quite interesting the study materials have more to them than would first greet the eye. They are basically elementary themselves but there is a great deal to observe in that particular field. You could probably turn a half a dozen universities loose, researching for the next five hundred years, and they probably wouldn't exhaust all the things and stuff they would find about study. It's marvelous.

For instance, I have a photographer that's working here weekends and doing a little bit of darkroom work, and he has just taken his examinations for his professional society. He's apparently just finished a couple of years of full—time study in the field of photography and so forth. And he's very interesting. He's very interesting to watch from the basis of study. Although he works as a professional darkroom man in London during the week, he has never really learned the fundamentals of photography and he has not learned what is important in the field of photography yet. Now, either this was a fault in study or not enough practical or something of this sort, but he has not learned what's important. And it's very interesting that he will stand and yammer at me... I will be down there working on something or other while he's there—I'll go down and work for a couple of hours on a couple of days over the weekend, a little relaxation—but he'll be yammering at me about something or other and asking me questions.

He violates the first thing: he thinks he knows, you see. He hasn't found out that there's a lot of things he doesn't know; so therefore, his mind is not open to learning anything. So when you tell him something, he goes on talking about something of the sort. And I've now gotten to him to a point of overwhelm where although he goes on talking about something else, he will still do what's right. You get the idea. Now, that's an accomplishment but it's... But he keeps talking to me—or he kept talking to me; I finally settled this—about the enlarger.

There's a big Micromatic 5 x 7 enlarger which is called a "cold—light enlarger" That is to say it has tubes in it instead of bulbs and this is a cold light. That is to say it's like your fluorescent lights except very high, high blue. Well, this is a very interesting enlarger It's a doll. It

sets on three different lenses and all you have to do is set it on another track. And it goes up and down, keeps anything in focus. It does most anything, you see. Beautiful piece of equipment.

Well, he apparently is used to some other kind of enlarger, something of the sort. And he keeps yammering away about this enlarger—the value of a cold—light enlarger as versus a condenser enlarger.

Now, you don't have to know anything about these terms, just balderdash. Just showing you there's differences here. A condenser enlarger has some magnifying glasses in it to spread the light evenly. But a cold—light enlarger, of course, the light is perfectly evenly spread. But a cold—light enlarger does not give you any great degree of contrast like a condenser-type enlarger. There's two types of enlargers.

So he's standing there worrying and worrying and worrying about the fact that this is a cold—light enlarger that doesn't give a high degree of contrast. He kept at this; he kept at it and he kept at it. And I wasn't paying him much attention for a while, but after all I finally said, "What is this fellow talking about?" He's talking about contrast. That is, the blackness of the black and the whiteness of the white in a negative or a print. And I suddenly realized what was wrong with him. He didn't know that this is something you do... The contrast of a print—well, you change the contrast—the print is dependent mainly upon film, not on the enlarger. And if you want to change the contrast of a print you make your developer stronger or weaker or you use a different grade of paper, and you can change it like turning the light on and off. You get the idea? I mean, here's this huge degree of variation that you can get out of the difference of developer. And as far as the enlarger is concerned, the difference is just about a quarter, you know, tiny; there's hardly any... You... In fact, nobody without a magnifying glass and a densitometer and a whole bunch of fancy instruments could tell the difference between a condenser enlarger and a cold-light enlarger. You couldn't really tell the difference. Of course, you can tell the difference on a condenser enlarger because it doesn't evenly spread the light. And you notice that half of your print is dimmer than the other half so it has a fault!

I finally rounded up on him and I said, "Well, wait a minute." I said, "In the final analysis what you're trying to get is a picture. And the type of enlarger that you say has all the contrast in it, and so forth, won't spread the light evenly enough. And it spreads the light so unevenly that it ruins your prints, so you don't get a picture with them. Now," I said, "let that be the end of it. As far as if you want contrast is concerned, why, just go over there on the developing tray and in the developing tray double the concentration of developer or half the concentration of developer and," I said, "you'll get all the differences that you want. Now, you got it?" And he was going on

muttering about this, but the mutter trailed off and so forth, and I haven't heard anything about enlargers since.

I thought, that's all very interesting. That's all very interesting because here are a bunch of stuff, here are a bunch of considerations and so forth. This man must have been taught with ferocity on the subject of enlargers and how one was contrasty and one was not contrasty with a whole bunch of missing datum. He must have been taught as though all of this was very important. It's completely unimportant. He's worrying about some little scrap of something and apparently nobody taught him anything about the fact that you can produce very black blacks or just pale gray blacks dependent upon what developer you use or what concentration of developer. Apparently nobody taught him the essential or he missed the essential in the textbook, don't you see, and he's flying around over here.

Well, I've noticed about this boy that he is full of tips. Brother, he's got more tips than you can shake a stick at. He knows that a pressman will occasionally flash a negative at a wall to presensitize the film before he takes a picture in a darkroom. This is a trick that one pressman in one thousand pulls once in his lifetime. Do you follow me? A trick. He knows all these tricks. Just run off just tons of these tricks. And I say, "Don't let the temperature vary, now, in developing that film or you'll get grain"—which is true.

and that's very important—he doesn't know much about that. But he knows a bunch of tricks about you mix some bromide with some *bra—ruff* and then you eventually get a double composite positive *roff roff*. You got the idea. I've been watching this sort of thing. I sighed. I said, "Well, I'll make a photographer out of him yet."

But the main thing—the main thing that's of value to us and that I suddenly began to alert to is several of our study factors, you see, were out as he was studying and are out in his practice. And the one new one that I noticed and suddenly saw very familiar amongst some very slightly acquainted auditors, you know, out in the fringe—they hardly haven't done any auditing at all; they haven't had much training of any kind whatsoever—boy are they hell on tricks! Boy they're willing to listen to you all day long, as long as you will tell them some quick short-cuts and some tricks.

Tricks. Like how do you get a pc to answer up the question—a trick, see, of some kind or another. How do you detect a green—type thetan from a blue—type thetan without the use of an E-Meter, see. The coloration of eye change while running certain types of processes. These guys are deadly on these things, see. They're all completely unessential tricks. They're just bric-a-brac, you see. They're quite interesting but they're just bric-a-brac. And that same guy couldn't for the life of him sit down and give straight standard auditing on a straight standard command.

So I see tricks and odd bits and so forth as a sort of a dispersal approach to the subject of auditing. In other words, approach it from the fringe and somebody who's never really studied to be an auditor will pretend a great knowledge of the subject and then pick up a whole bunch of fringe tricks without knowing anything about where they fit or how to use them or anything else. Boy, he talks wonderful auditing. He sounds terrifically interesting, don't you see. But then you get him to sit down in the chair and simply utter the auditing command and acknowledge—get it answered and acknowledge the pc and handle the pc's origin and give the next auditing command—just a good, solid, main—course job of auditing—he's not there. All he does is pull tricks. And it isn't the tricks that get anybody anyplace.

And that, I began to realize, was what was wrong with psychiatry and psychology. They're full of tricks. All they do is nurse oddities. They are the greatest oddity collectors that anybody ever heard of. They remind you of stamp collectors. "Here is a rare stamp from Bungawoolaland. It was only printed once in 1899 to celebrate the cashiering of the king from the British army. Very rare." Value, as far as world affairs are concerned, as far as his own life is concerned, zero. Do you see? They apparently pick up all the hors d'oeuvres, all the scraps off the floor and everything but the main dish.

Now, psychiatrists can tell you the most marvelous things about cases. You listen to them and your jaw drops sometimes. They're not all dummkopf—they're all crazy but they're not all stupid. I've listened to some of their insane—asylum manifestations with the greatest of interest. I—also they do a very good imitation of them. I've actually been entertained by the hour by these blokes. But I suddenly realize, I have never heard one of them utter one essential piece of information that would have led to the resolution of a case. Fantastic hors d'oeuvres—no main course. Isn't that marvelous.

So apparently there is another phenomenon of some kind in the world of study. There's the fellow who can—who knows it and can do it, and then there's the fellow who knows all the tricks concerned with it and can't do it. Here is an odd fringe manifestation that I have spotted. So that when you get somebody to sit down and really be an honest-to-God, dyed-in-the-wool auditor who produces a terrific exact result—he or any of us have been through the same course of picking up all the tricks and asking all the questions as we moved in, don't you see, and these things start to blow. Their relative importance starts to assert themselves. Of course, they weren't important. And the eventual action is that these things all blow off and you've got a jolly good auditor. Now you go around and you ask him—let's say you're new at it and so forth, and you ask him, "Now, how do you get—how do you get the pc to look at you during the session?"

And he says, "What?"

“No, how do you get the pc to look at you?”

“Why do you want to know this?” Because of course he doesn’t. “Why do you want to know this?”

“Well, you know, you’re supposed to have the PC look at you before you acknowledge.”

Well now, these things can really come up the line, and you say, “Where did they get that? Where did that come from?” Well, in the first place it’s just an interesting trick which is used once in a while to a pc that you’re occasionally worried about “has he finished?” And once in a while you get a pc who will apparently finish and then go on. Well, if you start following the procedure of that pc of waiting until he looks at you and so forth, then you’re pretty sure, because sometimes he’ll look at you and his eyes will be real vague and then he’ll eventually give you a little nod like that—yeah. And you can give him the next command then without cutting off his line. This is one PC in a hundred. You understand? Now where, then, did the line come from. What is this? That was just a trick, you see. It’s relatively unimportant. You could live all your life without knowing it.

But where did they get the idea that on every pc—the PC has to look at the auditor before the PC gets acknowledged? Because this puts an awful strain on the pc. The pc, besides doing the auditing command, has to remember to look at the auditor or he won’t get another command. You got the idea? Now, where did he get this datum? And I suddenly remembered; I actually dug up where the datum comes from.

There *is* another datum. And it’s a very important datum. And that is that a pc who doesn’t look at the auditor will always respond very well to an ARC break assessment. You understand, he’s not always visibly ARC broke, but you can always get an ARC break off of him. And I’m always leery of a pc who never looks at the auditor And a PC who will slew around and sit sideways in the chair, I don’t go any further; I just assess for the ARC break right now. And I always find it. So it is just an indicator of an ARC break. Well now, just an indicator of an ARC break, you see.

Well, to a finished auditor, it’s worth knowing, so forth. There are other indicators to an ARC break, too. He also set bad goals and he also did this and he also did that. But one of them is that when you’re supervising sessions or watching a TV demo or something like this, and you can see that pc and he’s just sitting sideways, you know, and he never looks at the auditor, he never looks at the auditor Well, you know that if you did an ARC break assessment on him, why, he—you’d find an ARC break.

Well, this isn't—this is not first—rank information. It's about third—rank information, but it's valuable, see. It has some value. But out of this we make the fact—now, we can move it upstairs, then, misapply it, and say that “Never acknowledge a pc until the pc has looked at the auditor”—that's any PC. Now we have got the data stretched out of shape, haven't we. The datum is now out of focus. There is no longer any reason to give it this much attention, but by giving it attention then we put an awful strain on practically every pc we audit.

See, he gets introverted; he's busily, deeply introverted in his case and he isn't about to look at the auditor. He's really quite unaware of the auditor He's back on the track someplace or another but he isn't ARC broke.

Now, if we waited for that pc to look at the auditor before we acknowledged, what—this is what would happen. He'd sit there interested in his own case, willing to talk to the auditor and so on. “What's the matter? What's happening? Wonder what's up?” You know, he's about to ask what's up and the auditor says, “Thank you,” so he says, “Well, that's all right.” He had to pull himself all the way up the track.

Well, oddly enough, if you pull this trick very often on one of the Power Processes, why, the guy would practically go around the bend because he's being pulled across too much track just to get an acknowledgment. He'll very shortly then go on auto. He'll start—you know, the auditor will give him the command and he'll give himself the command and then something runs it down here. Do you understand?

So there's mainline information that is real important meat. This is the stuff, see. And then, of course, any subject matter, is—like any dinner, gets surrounded by—or the better dinners—gets surrounded by hors d'oeuvres and dessert and scraps on the floor and chamber music and, you know, that sort of thing. But if you depended on the hors d'oeuvres and the scraps on the floor and the chamber music, you'd leave that table awful hungry. Do you follow?

So an auditor in training should differentiate, should differentiate amongst types of data. Now, there's main—course data. That is the datum, don't you see. That is *crash*. See, that's big, important, senior datum that will add up to a practice, it's generally applicable and so forth. And then there's data that you should know in order to apply the main data properly. And then there is data that if you knew it, you would appear very clever and that normally wraps itself around like the parsley and so forth. It—well, it's “nice” but it doesn't have very great value. It's interesting. It amplifies it. It's run into sometimes. It's of interest. But what's the main—course datum in auditing.

Well now, when somebody does a shift on what a main—course datum is (namely me), a lot of people go very badly adrift. Well, we used to teach a main—course datum on the subject of this: you audit the pc in front of you. Very important datum in its day. And if you are auditing in private practice someplace, you jolly well should. Because there's nobody else there. But that was before grading was producing results and that was before organization. So an organization auditor doesn't audit the pc in front of him at all. Not anymore. He audits the process. And if he sees some bad indicator, sends him to Review. And that's the main—course datum. And that's a breeze because that's teamwork auditing.

The auditor is there; he's to lay the exact process to the exact end phenomena. When the end phenomena occurs—bang—that's it. If the end phenomena is not approaching, if the bad indicators are there, the goals and gains are sour, the pc is breaking down somewhere or other—that's it! Review. Because the auditor is—can be part of what's wrong.

You don't want to take a chance on this, even yourself. Pc may be peculiarly mad at *you*, or the pc—there might be something wrong with your comm cycle as far as the pc's concerned, or there's something you haven't picked up. And in the case of some auditors, why, they've got that wrong with them too, so they've got a blind spot as far as the pc is concerned when it's wrong also with the pc. Weird things occur on this line.

So let's just throw all those irregularities out and let's put the pc on a standard approach and let's just take up everything with him that could possibly be wrong with a case. Well, I've just achieved that little technical trick and that was quite a trick. There is a policy letter now of a couple of days ago which has on it every possible thing that could be wrong with a pc and why they aren't running. There's forty—four lines on it.

Now, to get that piece of technology together and to put it in a form of order of importance and likelihood and juggle it up was quite a trick. A lot of case experience went along with this. What you're going to teach every auditor in the HGC, then, each one of these things and to pick it up without a form and without a list and it's all got to be done and so forth... Well, in the first place, I couldn't do it. Sitting there auditing that pc, to be able to do one—the right one of forty—four different possibilities—that sounds much. Particularly when the pc, unbeknownst to me, may have an overt on me as the auditor and is merely hard to audit from my point of view simply because the group is out. When this possibility enters in, don't you see, why, it tells you at once that I shouldn't be repairing any pc that I myself am auditing routinely. It tells you right away that it would be a—the source of the case failures when you have them. That would be the reason cases failed.

Now, let me show you what used to happen in the bad old days. Auditor goes in, starts a session. The pc says—”What goals would you like to set for this session?”

The pc says, “None.”

The auditor says, “Oh well, all right. Uhhh... uhm... uhm... uhm... uh... Do you have an ARC break?” There’s no read. “Do you have a present time problem?” There’s no read.

Pc says, “Well, it’s just that I just don’t have any goals to set. I—go ahead and audit me if you want to. I just don’t have any...”

“Well, all right. I’ll audit you.” Doesn’t go right.

Auditor finally takes a break and goes and sees the D of P and says “I got a D of P down here that wouldn’t set goals for this session.” And the D of P sort of looks at the folder and he asks the auditor some questions, and they figure out—and all of a sudden they figure out that the guy’s mother-in-law and so forth audited him once, and it’s probably a restimulation of an incident in Arslycus, and we really ought to invent a new process called *whizzeroobang—pup*, and we ought to run it. But the auditor gets that process wrong and goes back and audits the pc on something else, and the pc starts looking worse. And this goes round and round and round with a tremendous number of errors being committed all the way along the line.

All right. Now look at this—look at this as neated—up technology. Auditor sits down; pc’s sitting there. Auditor says, “What goals would you like to set for this session?”

Pc says, “None.”

Auditor says, ‘All right. Thank you very much. Is it all right with you—anything you’d care to ask or say before I end this session?’

And the pc says, “What’s up?”

“Well, I’m going to have to send you to Review. I’m sorry. All right, that is the end of session. Thank you. All right, now here, come along with me.

And it goes by Estimation, gets his chit, takes him over to Review and moves him right in over to Review and a Review Auditor who is an expert on assessment. That is the main thing he’s an expert on. He can—he knows—he’s picked because he knows a meter backwards. He never misses a read. And that’s it.

Then the auditor goes back over and reports and does something useful. And the D of P goes on with his room assignments and his auditor training, and he is not bothered with all this. And the auditor goes and files things or writes some letters in the Department of Schedules and

something—something goes on during that particular auditing period and pc's over there for—oh, I don't know, he could be over there all day.

Pc comes into session and says he's not going to set any goals, well, I don't think that the organization ought to stay it. The organization didn't go out last night and get drunk. So the D of P—the D of P is over there and doing his work very happily, and the auditor's going on and doing some useful work, and they're not disturbed by all of this figure—figure—figure—good reasons why they can dive sideways and go off standard technology and that sort of thing. Because it isn't standard technology at fault. It never is. It'll be one of forty—four things. Never standard technology at fault, weirdly enough.

So, the Review Case Officer or auditor over in Review—he's in a different division. He didn't have to take any orders from the D of P He didn't have to take any orders from the auditor. The only thing he's got to do, he just takes the responsibility for the case. So the preconceived ideas of the auditor now do not apply. Important. The auditor might not like green-headed people or something.

The considerations of the D of P and his conclusions: they're—they don't apply because the D of P is absolutely forbidden ever to interview a *pc*—*ever* to interview a pc—*ever* to talk to an auditor about a pc. Never! Ethics chit, man. “The D of P was seen today to be interviewing a pc. Ethics chit. Two week suspension. Cut his buttons off on the parade ground.”

Because looking and talking to the pc isn't a statistic, is it? Only the case folder is a statistic. Only the case folder Only the amount of TA that the pc got. Only did he make his goals and gains. Only what process was run with what wording. Only how long was it run, do you see? What was the end result of running this process? Is there still TA in that process? This is statistics, statistics, statistics—that's all—out of the folder.

Of course, you shoot an auditor for ever giving you a false attestation. Like he got 495 TA divisions in that particular session. Actually, the only way that you could get that would be to hook an E-Meter up to a helicopter But you get something like that—you don't want any auditor that'll falsely report things.

And then you just depend utterly, completely and only upon the case folder You do your case supervision—don't ever talk to the pc. Never! And never talk to an auditor about a pc. Auditor comes in, “What am I going to do about Bill?”

“What are you going to do about Bill?” the D of P is supposed to say. “Who is Bill?”

“Well, my pc.”

“Hmmm. One Job Endangerment Chit. You’re trying to get me to give you an unusual solution.” Job endangerment. That’s the truth. We’re now talking technology. We’re not talking ethics. That’s the truth.

A student who comes up to a Supervisor in a course and says, “What cute little trick can I run on the pc I’m running at night, because he keeps standing on his head in the chair?” Well, that Supervisor should at that moment turn in to Ethics a Job Endangerment Chit. Somebody’s trying to persuade him to violate the rules of the road. Because for sure, if that case is standing on its head in the chair, there is no trick known to man or beast, because the answer you’d give would be based upon the answer—information you’re being given which is probably false.

The best place for the guy who’s standing his head on a chair would be in Review being gone over very carefully on a standard list which would pick up everything that could be wrong with a case, see. All those things would have to be taken into account. We’d find nonstandard processes, unflat processes, broken auditing appointments, ARC breaks and a horrendous PTP—the guy is in court every morning being divorced. And we say, other than that there’s nothing wrong with the case. You get the idea.

There’s too many things go awry here, don’t you see, for this *cute little trick*. There’s no *cute little trick* that will put a human being back together again. They’re like Humpty Dumpty, and we’re catching them all. They’re in the shape of Humpty Dumpty right now. They’ve fallen several hundred trillion years, and they have landed with an awful splash, and putting them back together again does not consist of a cute little trick of how do you flavor eggnog.

If this guy’s in trouble in his immediate environment, you can count on the fact that it’s *trouble*. If a pc doesn’t gain in processing, man, there are reasons why, and they are not covered by a cute little trick of how do you hold your little finger while you’re setting your E-Meter That won’t cover it! A detective agency might cover it.

Well actually, the truth of the matter is the fellow leaves the HGC every afternoon and then goes over for his Turkish bath and colonics. Only he’d never bothered to inform anybody of this. He’s mixing two therapies. He’s holding down a screaming present time problem of a terrible gastric upset every time he’s in session. Do you understand? So he’s got a present time problem. Processing won’t gain over the top of it. Nobody finds this present time problem, don’t you see? Because—why they don’t find it is just because it isn’t being assessed for You can get the data, but if you don’t get the data, you’re not going to be able to do anything about it. So you better go about the business of getting all the data that you can get on the case, don’t you see?

So the new method, then, is the auditor sits there, goes into a standard session, expects standard responses which he will get, audits a standard comm cycle, moves straight on up through standard grading, every—after every day turns in the case folder. And the D of P, he does standard D-ofP'ing. He looks at it, “What’s the TA? What were the goals and gains, and so forth? The process run? Now, let’s see, last twenty minutes here, we had .5 TA divisions in the last twenty minutes. Well, how many divisions did we have yesterday? Oh, we had lots more TA divisions than that. Yeah, oh, this process is going flat. I think he probably ought to run it tomorrow to just a little cognition or something like that—that would be the standard response for an ordinary process—and get the hell off of it, and go onto the next indicated process up the line.”

So that’s what he’d write on here and so forth and so on. But as he’s looking at this—he picks up the next form and he’s looking at this, and it says...

By the way, what I’m talking to you about is not theoretical. I’m talking to you from the hard core of practiced experience. I’ve gotten in trouble when I haven’t followed these rules myself

He goes into this, he says, “Pc says, ‘Not to have too much trouble in this session.’ *Hmm*. Well, what’s the TA for this session. The TA was twenty—seven for 2_ hours. *Augh*, pc isn’t in trouble. Where are they on the process? Continue the process. Next.” That’s right. Getting too much TA for somebody to be in trouble. You understand? His gains are okay and so forth. Just one little sour goal, you know. The guy was apprehensive. So we didn’t pay any attention to it. That case is flying.

All right. Pick up the next folder, and the pc says—his goals and gains is blank. “‘The pc was very restive this session and didn’t want to run any processes.’ Who, Smithers. Auditor Smithers. How many hours were wasted here? *Ummm—hmmmm*. All morning and all afternoon auditing a pc with an ARC break. Well, Mr. Smithers, we’re going to make a citizen out of you, and here goes an ethics chit.” “Smithers, Ethics Hearing: Running pc all day, ARC break, not following out proper hat and sending pc instantly to Review when pc wouldn’t set any goals.” Another chit: “Pc to Review.” Total action. No unusual solutions. Next case.

Smithers comes back the next day with a blurred look in his eye and so forth, and he’s saying, “Well actually, I thought I could help him.”

“Oh, thinking, huh? We’ll turn another chit in on you.”

And that’s the way you do it. And the next thing you know the auditor knows exactly what’s expected of him: He’s supposed to run the case. Of course, there’s a big kick on running a

case like this because all of a sudden you see these cases start going *zoom!* The cases you're auditing really start winning. Don't you see? You're not running a whole bunch of oddities and little fringe—area things that are getting in the road of this, that and the other thing, you see.

Case ran fine for three days, fell on its head and didn't run anymore. Rolly coaster. You say, "Oh, well, roly coaster That means a potential trouble source which means the person is connected with a suppressive person. We got the textbook answer; we know exactly what it is." No, we send him to Review. It's all we ever send anybody. We always send him to Review, see.

And over in Review, they go down the line and they've got one of their lines: PTS. Of course, he sees the PTS because the guy roly—coastered. "PTS. Yes, yes, he's connected to several suppressives and is a member of a suppressive group—citizen of the United States. Has Wilson as the prime minister" So but Review never concerns itself with this. Review doesn't concern itself with that; just fills it in with a big, fat check. It's concerned with the case and this is part of a case picture, you see.

Now, when it gets back to the Examiner and the Examiner sees this Review report—the Examiner sees that PTS is checked—he doesn't send the case back to the HGC; he sends the case to Ethics. And the case goes over to Ethics. And the Ethics Officer sits there, and the Ethics Officer knows his business, he's only supposed to do certain things and he does those certain things just rat—a—tat—tat. And what the Ethics Officer does is say, 'All right, you seem to be a potential trouble source here. What suppressive are you connected with?'

"Well, I'm not really connected with any suppressive. I don't know why they sent me over to Ethics. You people think you're something, don't you?" you know.

Well, some Ethics Officers could be expected to be just a little bit touchy at this point and say, "One week's suspension for being discourteous to an HCO personnel," but you wouldn't find that would be routine. They would say, "Now, who's the suppressive? Somebody who wouldn't—who's dead against Scientology, your being in Scientology, raises hell with you and so forth. Who is this person and so forth?"

"Well, nobody."

Now, here's your interesting phenomenon. That guy believes this. He believes this because a suppressive always pulls generalities. Generality is the stock in trade, and the suppressive becomes invisible in the environment to the person and the person can't spot the suppressive. So the only thing Ethics does is work this over—with or without a meter, to hell with it. "Who is the suppressive. Suppressive person or suppressive group?" And he'll search it

and search it and search it. Now, if Ethics is good, why, Ethics will just finally hit it, and say, 'Ah, so—and—so and so—and—so and so—and—so and so—and—so. Is that right?'

The guy says, "You know, that is right!"

'All right, there you are.'" Ethics knows they got it because the person's face lit up like a Christmas tree.

But if you don't find the suppressive or you spot the wrong one, it's like indicating the wrong bypassed charge in an ARC break assessment. Nothing happens with the case. This is quite remarkable to watch. You have to do one or two wrong before you're suddenly convinced of the fact. You have to do somebody wrong and then bring somebody—that somebody back in a couple of days later and say I must have goofed, and suddenly find out that he has never informed anybody of this but he lives with his mother and his mother routinely and regularly, and so forth, tells him that he's being blasphemous because Scientology is against God and he is after all a Christian, and tells him this every morning at breakfast at some length. But he somehow or other has just not noticed this. You see, we spotted the wrong suppressive the first time.

Now, the phenomenon is this. You say, "Well, your uncle is a suppressive and we've got that now."

And the person says, "Yes, my uncle's a suppressive. Yes, good, yes."

'I want you to disconnect from your uncle.'" No, you haven't got the right one.

"No," he says, "no, I don't—I don't see how I c—don't see how I—disconnect from my uncle. Hadn't got anything to do with it at all."

Well, you haven't found the right suppressive. You haven't indicated the right bypassed charge, you understand? So you just better look further You look a little bit further, and so forth. Uncle, hell; ifs his boss. See, you all of a sudden say, "Well, it's your boss. He's kidding you all the time about going down to the organization because you're crazy. Is that—is that the fellow?'"

"Yeah, that's the fellow."

"Well, that person's a suppressive and here is your order, now: you handle or disconnect."

Person will say, "Oh, well, the hell with him. Yeah, sure, disconnect. Yeah, nothing to it." Bang, bang. He goes right along with it *zoooooop*. The only time you find Ethics laying an egg is when they just fail to spot the right suppressive. That's all.

Well, Ethics spots that; the person does handle the situation or disconnect or arrange for the other person to be audited or do something straight away—bang—straightens it up. Move him back into the HGC. The auditor's back at the old stand now. He starts out. He doesn't discuss this in any way.

He just starts where the processing was left off and he carries on from there. It however, it's been a case remedy or something that's recommended by Review, he will run the case remedy before he resumes the regular Grade processing. And he goes away.

So that you're left on an assembly line which is an assembly line. It just goes right down the belt pocketa—pocketa—pocketa—pocketa. And the auditor is there—he's just got to put the rivet in the right place. That's all. Do you understand?

And the D of P—he's just right down the same line. He's got to make sure there's enough auditors standing there to put the rivets in the right place. And when that flat ball bearing comes up that belt, they mustn't go into a total psychotic break because they've got a flat ball bearing on the Tech belt. They just pick it up and say, "Look, flat ball bearing. All right. Where do flat ball bearings go? They go to Review."

All right. Now, up the line up here—up the line up here, the Org Exec Sec and so forth notices there's a deterioration of statistic. That is to say there aren't quite so many people being processed up to a certain level. The statistics which are turned in by the Department of Inspection and Reports under the new organization will show that there's a declining statistic. In other words, processing is not as successful lately in the Tech Division as before. Now it is time to go and look at all the Review chits. And they find out that auditing cycles are out on several auditors. They tell the D of P about it. Actually, he sends those auditors for special training and he puts in the comm cycle on these auditors very, very good and that smooths it out again. Do you understand?

Now, that's teamwork action. And out of that action, as poorly as it is in, in several orgs at this particular moment... It's in very flimsily. I won't say poorly but very flimsy. They haven't had Sec EDs on this more than a couple of months.

Do you know these outfits are starting to turn out Releases on the same cotton—picking processes they were running on people before? Isn't this peculiar? Oh, I should think that would be *very* peculiar. It's the same process. It's the same org. It's essentially the same personnel. But it's not the same result. Entirely different result. And it's gotten so bad in one org that they're challenging any reason for the Power Processing; they're doing so well on the lower—level processes all of a sudden. It's fantastic. They haven't had any new technology. They've had new

org pattern. They've had new teamwork. And even when that's in poorly, it starts working pocketa—pocketa—pocketa—pocketa.

Now, let's say two Class VII Auditors go to HASI Podunk which is a small org and which is having all of its staff released but it's growing. Well, they're the odd men out, aren't they? This HASI has got its—it's running on its assembly line on ordinary processes, reviewing its ordinary... See? But there's no review for a Class VII on Power Processes, is there? Well of course, the Power Processing would be done from Review. That is to say, those two Class VII would simply be attached to Review and would be releasing staff one right after the other in Review. But how do they get around this liability? Well, they never do their own folders. Each one of them is the Case Supervisor of the other one. And by the time they've balled up two or three cases, we will have the third Class VII there to be their reviewer. Do you see how it works out. And you'd be an absolute fool to do your own case folders, complete fool. You should never, never go auditing around when you don't have a Review handy, because you miss the main reasons for the case decline.

So there are several things that you want to become. You want to become an absolute whiz—bang as a Review Auditor Just learn to assess, for God's sakes. Just be able to take a pc and assess lists and service facs and forms and lists and make lists and run an E-Meter so that you never miss a read even for a split second and so forth, really make it sit up and talk. You want to be a darn good, darn good assessor on a meter And you want to know what all the processes are that are called for on a form and all the processes that might possibly be run because they're of interest.

And then, as a very, very excellent Review Auditor, be able to do in the HGC a completely standard, unvarying job of auditing which requires no assessment, requires no frills and nothing but read the TA, run the process, handle the pc's origins, start and end the session.

I'm not now talking about Class VII at all; I'm talking about ordinary, run—of—the—mill 0 to Iv auditors is what I'm talking about. And then right in that same category, you want to be able to sit there and be able to knock out case folders bang, bang, bang, bang, bang! Know exactly what to look for in a case folders and so forth. Be able to take over the whole load as a D of P. Do a Case Supervisor job to end all Case Supervisor jobs. Just learn to do it totally by statistic. Never miss. Know exactly when to send them to Review and when not to send them to Review. Know when to investigate one of your auditor's comm cycles or not.

Of course, you realize that after you've had one auditor send three pcs in a row to Review and so forth that it might not all be pcs. And you've had a couple of pcs sent to Review that

Review couldn't find anything wrong with. Well, don't blame it on Review. An auditor's comm cycle can louse up a case. Might be right there in the HGC; so then you start reviewing auditors.

Learn to do those things. Learn to be able to sit there and do a Case Supervisor job to end all Case Supervisors. What is a flat process? What are the processes to be run? How long should they be run? What is the next process to be run afterwards? What are the good indicators that can be read from a folder? What are the bad indicators that can be read from a folder? How much TA is TA? You understand?

Along that, I could recommend a course in cryptography. Cryptography is the skill of reading secret writing. I have become quite remarkable at this. I have a very powerful magnifying glass that sometimes by getting the impressions on the paper I get so that I don't have a misunderstood word on the thing in front of me. And one night I was actually able to invoke the assistance of four HCO personnel and the HCO Exec Sec, and we managed to work it out, and we finally found out what it was. So it'd be very good for you to develop a certain telepathy as to what did the auditor mean. Of course, an auditor's writing fast and furious, don't you see, and they very often don't get all down. The word is "a *veuoouoo—(squiggle)*," you know. Now, learn to do that.

So what are these three things? Learn to be a perfectly marvelous Review Auditor Be able to do an assessment to end all assessments. Know all the processes that have ever been run on anything anyplace to any result. Know them all. Be able to run a meter so doggoned good that you just *never* miss a read. Know all about metering. Know any process that might even vaguely or dimly be connected with that form of the Review. Just be a whiz—bang as far as that type of auditing is concerned. The highest type of auditing there is. Be very good at it. And be absolutely, *fantastically* good at turning out the meat course. Just be terrific at turning out the meat course.

Sit down, start the session, fix it up, clear the auditing command, get a couple of buttons straightened up, handle the pc into the session, get the body of the session going, utter the first auditing command and keep your auditing comm cycle going straight through to the end of the session without a single whimper, yip—yap, goof, misduplication or failure to observe your end phenomena and so forth—just a perfectly standard, straight, terrifically straightforward *bong, bong, bong* job of auditing.

And be able to step aside from that 100 percent and be able to do cases without ever looking at an auditor, talking to an auditor or looking at a pc, talking to a pc, going around asking for any information or anything of the sort. Just read it right straight out of that case folder, know exactly what that pc's doing and know exactly what PC to keep in session and continue and what PC to move out.

With that goes a certain sensitivity to the frailties of certain auditors, particularly on lower level. You may have even a I today or even a 0 auditing in an HGC. You can do it providing you've got your ethics in and you're cracking the whip and you know your business. Yes, he could only run a 0 process, that's for sure, but with proper supervision that could happen.

You'd have to have a squawk—box system for one thing. You'd have to have it so that you could listen in on a session occasionally and find out what the hell was going on in the session, and then not use the data particularly for anything but to correct your false attestations if they came through. One thing is being audited but another thing is written in the folder. You know, that sort of thing. You have to be because you find their ethical standard matches their case standard which is usually pretty low when they're low on their classifications. But you could still do it, you understand?

But as a person move up the line, you'll find out that some auditor... You're handling nonreleased auditors, don't you see. And we've done it for years so it can be done. And you know that this auditor—you just never, never, never put him to auditing another man. Just never. He'll just cut him to ribbons. Or you know a certain auditor there, if you have anything to do—you—if you put this auditor on a young man, he will just butcher him. He seems to go round the bend on this particular subject, you see. And you know that you've got a matronly lady and you know very well that you had better never, never, never, never, never put her auditing any young person because she just chops them to bits or goes into a cave—in on them.

And you learn certain things. You'll gradually learn your auditors and that there are certain types of assignments they're very successful on and certain types they're not, and there're certain types of this and that, that have really nothing to do with cases.

But this is just auditor assignment which is another subject entirely. How do you assign the auditor to the pc?

And then there's another one which you might dimly be interested in: the—a D of P, of course, also has to be able to assign rooms. And at Saint Hill this is done by magic—there being no rooms to assign, don't you see. And that's the main trick of room assignment, is assigning rooms which don't exist and still getting auditing done. That's the main difficulty.

But now, if you were able to do those things and if you also knew the—if you also knew the general situation with regard to the org board and the relationship of the Technical Division to the other divisions, and if you knew those things, why, boy you would really be very, very, very successful. People will really like to have you around, man.

Now, you drop one of those skills out and you're that much less a producing auditor. It's a lucky HGC staff that could detach almost any one of its people to the Qualifications Division to act as Review. That would be a very lucky and a very, very well—trained HGC. Generally it'll be quite different. Some Qual Sec and so forth will be haggling and fooling around with the Org Exec Sec trying to get Zilch transferred from the HGC to the Department of Review to be the new Case Officer because somebody has gone up to Director of Review and has left a hole.

“Oh, you can't have him!”

“Why can't I have him?”

“Well, he's the best auditor I've got.”

Why, I ask the question at that time. Well, what's goes with this fellow as a training officer that he's got a “best auditor”? At least he ought to have three best auditors. And of course, you'd find he was being very cooperative, too, because he wants a good auditor over there in Review; otherwise his case supervision becomes unthinkably difficult. His technical statistic will just go to pieces promptly and at once. He'll find out that then he'll have to take over his own case—his own review and case supervision.

Now, we can see, we can see a city office just formed in north Chicago or something like that which takes care of the suburb of Euphoria. And they—the fellow in charge of that, he hadn't learned better yet, but he has his own ideas about all this and they're different than Ron's. And those—and he's decided that it's a waste of personnel to have somebody in the Qualification Division because they're not big enough yet, you see. So therefore, he has the D of P do his own review and also audit a pc—that's what seems logical. And then he wonders why, after he had a sudden burst of pc sign—ups, he doesn't have any more pcs. Oh, he doesn't have any more pcs because his tech is out.

And the quickest way you can get rid of pcs is not deliver good technology, don't deliver good results. If you don't deliver good results, why, you don't have any pcs. That's elementary.

Actually, you can run a bad HGC longer than you can run a bad Academy. A bad Academy—one that is—what—where tech is out in the Academy—will fold up in a matter of days or weeks. It's the wildest thing you ever wanted to see in your life. All of a sudden tech goes out in the Academy exclusively and then you're suddenly looking at an empty Academy. You wonder what happened.

I don't know how students get it on the grapevine. I really don't. And you change the D of T and you straighten it up and you get the lines in, and all of a sudden the Academy fills up in a matter of two weeks. Where'd they all come from? This is one that—actually I'm not joking.

This is bit of a baffler. It's absolutely true; it's quite factual that this does happen: When an Academy goes bad, it empties. And when it goes good, why, it fills right up again—very qui—quite quick. There's no comm lag.

There is a comm lag on the HGC as—I've measured one as long as six months. But boy, when the collapse comes, it takes six months to recover. And if you go in an HGC without any results for six months—without any good, standard, uniform results for six months—if you can build that place back together again in eighteen months, you're doing well. It happens a bit slower in an HGC but it's more permanent. When dey kills an HGC dead wit' bad technology, dey kills it much deader than you would suppose possible.

So anyway, the net gain here is that an auditor in training is not in actual fact merely being trained as an all—around auditor who does a one—man band and so forth. The auditor who's doing a one—man band—doing his own review and his own this and then auditing his pcs all night and trying to run a course and doing his own case supervision and so forth—is—just gets sloppier and sloppier and sloppier, and he'll get tireder and tireder, and next thing you know he isn't auditing. And it's happened to a lot of people. Well, that isn't the way you do it.

What you do is get in a city office, put it together in its proper formation and so forth. And then when you are training as a Scientologist in the vicinity of technical, and so forth, remember that there are now these zones. I don't expect there ever will be any additional zones. There'll be data, philosophic, organizational areas and that sort of thing, oh yes, but these quite—are really a bit different subjects than that of being an auditor.

But an auditor should know very well how to do those very things that I've enumerated. If an auditor can't do those things himself, he really will never quite understand what's happening while he is auditing. Do you follow? He'll never quite understand what's going on or what should be going on. And then his lines tend to go out because he's ignorant of what—which way to send the particle, don't you see, or what's happening. He'll sit and look at the folder in bemazement. If he's—if he's just doing a routine job of auditing and he doesn't know anything about folder marking and that sort of thing, and he gets his folder back and his folder says, "Change this process," he's absolutely baffled. Why should he change the process? and so forth. The thing was—he won't have any reason for it.

Well, he'll finally begin to believe in the implicit faith that the D of P is always right. And this implicit faith is touching but is unnecessary because it happens the D of P, if he's well trained, will be right. But the point is that there's no reason to be in mystery about it. The reason you change processes and do these things are very, very standard reasons.

So you should know something about case supervision. You *certainly* should know the main course of auditing: Just how do you sit down and bang one out, man. Bang out that session just as standard as standard is standard—standard comm cycle, standard processes, standard responses, standard auditor's reports. The fiendish glee with which a person can knock this into shape is quite something. It's a direction of "no difference" to be trained in that is a—has its own rewards.

Now, the only thing that ever makes you break a standard operation is when your pc goes nonstandard: Pc goes out and gets drunk the night before, their mother—in—law comes to visit them—something happens in their life, don't you see. They all of a sudden come down with sciatica and you can't figure out why. Actually, it turned out not to be sciatica but a dose of fleas they got from their dog. We don't care what it was. The net—the net product here is the pc went nonstandard. What do you do with a nonstandard pc in a standard session? Well, you better send them to where they handle flat ball bearings. Let's not blame ourselves as to what happened. No, let's just have the place where we handle the flat ball bearing—the Qualification Division—let's have that very well functioning.

Now, the auditor himself ought to be able to know how to do one of these things, not because he's going to do one in his standard sessioning, because as the org grows up and as the ranks of well—trained auditors thin in the Tech Division, there's going to obviously be a need for more Review Auditors. Because you're only holding your tech line together by the dint of the fact—you see, now you can get very—you can get almost sloppy because you know nothing is going to go wrong. You can put *anybody* onto auditing practically. By process of elimination, why, you will eventually get those off that shouldn't be there and those that are good will stay there, don't you see? But you should be able to do a good Review job, a good bang—up Review job which basically consists of: how's your metering? How can you assess? You should know these zones.

But then, of course, if you don't know the pattern of an organization around these things, then it's a great mystery. Why do you send anybody ever to Ethics? "We shouldn't punish people!" God, if I hear that one more time, I'm going to pull somebody's rug out from underneath them. Who the hell is punishing people, see; we're trying to make people well. If you—you can't take a highly enturbulated environment—it's brutal to take a highly enturbulated environment and try to push somebody through without ever trying to find out why or make them straighten out their environment. What are we going to do with the guy, just let him fall on his head? If you've got technology out in an area, you have to have some means of getting technology in; otherwise

you can't help anybody. Punish people? If all justice had been with the same purity of Scientology justice, the universe would not now have to be completely overhauled by us.

Of course, I use that advisedly. We're not out on the big kick, of course, to take over this planet and take over the universe and that sort of thing because that's—that'd be pretty bad to do that. We're not on this—we're not on that kick. No, no, you needn't worry about a full conquest of the planet or something like that because, frankly, it's nothing to worry about; it's just inevitable.

I was—the old gag about the people that had this sector a long time ago. They used to call themselves “The Espinol United Stars This Quarter of the Universe Is Ours.” They said it all in one breath and so forth. “The Espinol United Stars This Quarter of the Universe Is Ours,” and so forth. So I thought for a starter, for a starter, why, we ought to start somewhere up along the line in a year or two—after we'd done it, you see and so forth—we ought to start calling Scientology—never call it just Scientology, see; just use it all in one breath, you see—”Scientology This Planet Is Ours,” see.

That would seem to me to be an appropriate name, because the funny part of it is, you see, nobody's taken any ownership of it, you know. Nobody owns this planet. It's quite pathetic. Here's this planet lying here unowned. People are always fighting *to* own it. I think that's very silly. Why don't they just own it? Seems to me to be much more direct.

But we would have to earn the right to say that in many ways, and the way to earn the right to say that is just go on and do exactly what we're doing right this minute. And if an auditor's an auditor, why, he ought to know these various sectors and actions. And the organizational pattern we've got is working out, man, it's just working out smooth as grease. We keep on along the lines we're going on right now, it would inevitably happen. And we're on our way. We're on our way right this minute. It's mostly a question of how fast do we make it or how slow do we make it. And the extraordinary solution—any extraordinary solution put on the line is put on the line simply by the smallness of time still operating.

But anyway, we'll try and get there before it all goes bang because I hate to see all that—all that plutonium and so forth wasted. Looks to me to be a terrific waste of the stuff. Because, you see, look at all the fresh water you could make out of sea water for Los Angeles with it or something like that, you know. It has other uses, other uses than surfeiting the appetites of the paranoids. So I think we'll probably make it all right if we work hard.

But anyway, I thought I ought to give you the word on what I considered a well—rounded auditor was these days and exactly what you should be able to do in order to consider yourself well rounded and well put together.

And I want to thank you for your very good attention today and apologize to you for not having talked to you... One of those weeks was mine oft the other one was pure pique against IRS and so forth over in Washington trying to seize Scientology in the United States, and I had to tell them no. And I told them no. And they're told for the moment. Now I will draw a deep breath and wind up some more steam and say no a little bit louder next time, and then maybe they won't try again. It isn't that there's huge trouble on the line; it's just that any time you're connected with a suppressive you are to some degree a potential trouble source, so I didn't want to make potential trouble sources out of you last week.

Thank you very much.