

BRIEFING OF REVIEW AUDITORS

A lecture given on 14 October 1965

Hubbard, L. R. (1965, 14 October). **Briefing of Review Auditors**. *Saint Hill Special Briefing Course*, (SHSBC-431). Lecture conducted from East Grinstead, Sussex

And this is a briefing of Review Auditors, 14 October 1965.

The whole situation boils down to this, is there are three data which I have not been able to teach orgs or Tech or anybody else. There are three data. They don't know these data as key data. These data don't have any either/or's or qualifications or "there are other cases," do you see? There are three data that are just smashers as far as cases, and so forth, are concerned. Our concern is with one of these, which is the second one. But what I'm going to—giving you your briefing—that I'll tell you what these three data are that we just can't really seem to get across—that I don't have any luck getting across at all.

So the reason why I'm talking to you is, in Review then, you will run into these three data all the time. Because they won't have gotten across in Tech. The Tech Division won't have gotten it across or the rest of the org or Supervisors won't have gotten them, don't you see? Or Ethics doesn't get them, don't you see? And they don't get these three data! See?

And the first one is that a high TA equals overrun and that there isn't any other reason for a high TA. There aren't 192 different reasons for a high TA. There's just one: it's overrun. And that's the only, the only reason you have a high TA. From a Review standpoint, then, you have to find out what's overrun. Do you see? From a Review standpoint.

All right. Covering this, then, a high TA always equals overrun and equals nothing else and is the problem of Review to find out *how* and *what* was overrun. The Review Auditor's problem is to find out what and how. All right. Therefore, raw meat walks in off the street and he's got a TA at 5.0. And he's never been audited and he has never been anywhere near Buddhism, mysticism, anything else. Well, you've got your work cut out. Do you see?

I'll plead with you. This isn't any reason to throw away the datum. Do you follow? Because the easy way out is you say, "Well, we can't find out what's overrun, so let's just throw away the datum." Well now, that's what the HGC auditor did; that's what the field auditor did; that is what Ethics did; and that is what the Course Supervisor did. They all threw away the datum. And they're looking now for mysterious reasons why the TA is high. And therefore, in view of the fact that they're all looking for it, as a Review Auditor, for heaven's sake, don't you do it too! Do you see? Because then we can't repair the case and nothing patches up.

Now, you're going to find some interesting things when you get into this. You'll see there's a TA sitting at 5.0. All right, it's an overrun. You're liable to get into some case and find out the fellow went into Christianity and had a big datum in Christianity and went release when he was six years old in Sunday school. And then he kept on studying religion. Do you follow? It's overrun. You got it?

Now, this bird took up a health course and he walked out there and he just was walking five miles every morning and he was getting up and he was doing sitting-up exercises and he was... terrific. He'd been an invalid and he used this therapy and there he is, boy! And he gets into terrible shape. And his TA is stuck at 5.0 and you want to figure out why it's an overrun. Well, he just did one too many push-ups. Do you follow? He didn't knock off the regimen when he was winning. You get the idea?

Ordinarily, I would say there was some kind of treatment or wisdom back of it which he then went beyond release. Because don't think we're so special that just because somebody is in Scientology then life all behaves differently. No, we in Scientology, and so forth, progress because we parallel what life is doing and we know more about it than people out in life, don't you see? But that doesn't mean the phenomena of Scientology doesn't happen elsewhere. It does, all the time. It isn't specialized to Scientology.

Now, I should imagine, these poor blokes in practically every therapy from Aesculapian, the witch doctor, the juju, anybody under the sun, has run across the overrun—release phenomena. Can you grab that as a datum? So we look on these things as all failed technologies. And we don't know what the original technology was—let me point that out to you—because it got alter-ised and they all went the route that we almost went. And I'll call to your attention that we *almost* went the route. We almost did.

Fifteen years we were overrunning a state of Keyed-Out Clear. We called it originally Clear, then we called it Keyed-Out Clear, and now we're calling it Release, because there *was* such a thing as a Clear. And the funny part of it is all the original works talk about a pure Clear. If you want to listen to the congress of 19—I think it was 57, 58, and so forth—t's talking about a pure Clear that we're making today. Do you see? But there was this intermediate stage and people would hit this, and that was the stage I was hitting with people as early as 1947, you see? And it made a Release, and it made an apparency of this other state. So the state had its harmonics, don't you see?

So the state is approached gradually. A Clear is somebody who hasn't got a bank. If you release somebody of the bank then he behaves like somebody who doesn't have a bank. Do you follow? But the only way you could guarantee his total behavior that way forever would be to have no bank at all. And then there wouldn't be any bank to get away from and that's, of course, clearing. Do you follow that?

So therefore, nobody else has made one of these things; don't worry about that. Clear: that's highly specialized as far as we're concerned. But these states of release is what you're handling in Review, and they're the ones that are going to give you trouble.

And the key datum of the whole thing is that a high TA equals an overrun. It isn't necessarily what was being run at the time the TA went high. And there you also come a cropper The guy is running PR PR 5, and the TA suddenly flies up and sticks at 5.0 and the auditor can't do anything. Well, bend your wits around to the complication that you may have restimulated an overrun Communication Release. Do you follow? And the guy drops straight back into the lockup in the bank which he had—which was an overrun Communication Release. Do you follow?

He might have gone back into that and Existence might not be flat. Isn't that interesting? The likelihood of this occurring is very slight, but it's still a possibility, do you see, that the TA is not high on what is currently being run. The TA might be high on a rudiments question.

Now, if—let's say the guy was a Problems Release, he'd been a Problems Release for many, many years, and somebody asked him a problems question in the rudiments. All of a sudden his TA goes up and sticks. And then they go on running the Power Process and the TA is up and stuck and nothing is moving with the case and then this looks like an awful bungle. So now what you have to find out is *what* was overrun. You see?

So your question is always asking, on this first item, "What was overrun?"

And believe me, if the auditor in the HGC did not solve it or the field auditor didn't solve it, and so forth, then it is *always* true that what they were repairing is not what was wrong.

If you try to fix the loudspeaker of a radio set when it is the mains plug that's broken (just to get corny about it), you can't, of course, fix the radio set. So if somebody kept on working on this and working on this and working on this and it wasn't solving it, then realize, please, that that wasn't what was wrong. So they've got the wrong overrun if they're trying to get a TA down—invariably and inevitably.

So if you look back through the person's folder and you find out they've been working on rehabilitation of former release and the TA was high and no TA, and they've been working on the rehabilitation of former release and the TA is high and so forth, don't discard the datum that a high TA equals overrun. The guy is rehabilitating the wrong release. It's just, they've never spotted the right release.

Now, we had one case here, actually, that for about five months was driving us all around the bend. And we were trying to rehabilitate former release on this person. We tried to rehabilitate him in 1950, 1952, 1958. We're trying to rehabilitate, time after time, a former release—thetan exterior. We worked and worked and worked on these things, don't you see? Having an awful time.

It happened in 1965. There was the auditor, right there. And that case did not resolve, because in the rehabilitation of the former release they had the wrong release they were trying to rehabilitate. And it was highly improbable that the case had had former releases of the states and at the times they were trying to rehabilitate them. Do you follow?

And the case had sat there and given a tremendous lot of end words to her auditor. I've forgotten exactly when it was; it was less than a year ago, wasn't it?

Male voice: Yeah.

And had given a whole bunch of end words and had gone Fourth Stage Release.

Male voice: The first PC in the Saint Hill HGC.

First pc in the Saint Hill HGC and gone Fourth Stage Release. Do you see the gag here?

Now, the first tendency is to throw away the datum that high TA equals overrun. Because, you see, you're trying to find the overrun and you don't find the overrun, so you throw the datum away and say the TA must be high from something else, do you follow me? You just haven't located the right overrun.

You see, the TA could be held up with half a dozen different overruns, but it would be held up with the one it's held up with. It wouldn't be held up with one of the others that could have held it up. Do you understand?

It is the one that it is. So all you've got to do—all you got to do—is find the right overrun and the TA will come down and the case will go release again. And the rehabilitation technique which you've got will do it, *providing* you have the right overrun.

Now, for instance, I rehabilitated what we were then calling a First Stage Release. I rehabilitated this release. I got a momentary floating needle. That was good enough for me; I wasn't going to push it any further. And I just came off of it right like that. But I noticed that when I came off of it the needle stopped floating. Well, I didn't want to push my luck. I didn't push my luck, because in the first place this case was going to be further audited, you see, on higher grades. So I just had the case declared and got away from it. And I started pushing the case along some other line of Power Processing and I didn't get anyplace.

And quite incidentally and almost by accident, I noted the fact that the case had been a Fourth Stage Release, and found it, and down came the TA and so forth. And the case was very, very ARC broken about Solo auditing on end words, too. Very ARC broken about the whole thing. Couldn't find any more end words that would read. She got very upset. I mean, the bank blew, and that was it. As far as she was concerned she was out of it—Release—she couldn't go back into it again, and so forth. Actually, the TA had come down and floated while she was looking through dictionaries. And I dug it all back up and refloated it and that was that. Do you follow me?

So your job in Review is definitely: if you got a high TA, don't come off of the concept a high TA equals an overrun. You just find out the right "when" and the right "what," and down it'll come—crash! And every time we've had trouble is when we haven't put this into action. Do you understand?

Male voice: Very well.

You got it?

Audience: Yes.

So that's not a datum, then, that you run away from. There's a high TA; that's an overrun. Where is the overrun? What was overrun? And the sky is the limit; it could be anything. Do you follow? You can get wilder than scat if you've got somebody that hasn't been audited very much and he's got a high TA. You're *wha-a-aw!* The sky's the limit. What was he doing that released him? That's the question. Something. You'll find out what it is.

Now, I haven't found a whole track former release, overrun, stuck TA. I'll just give you that as a little beneficial datum. I haven't found one. Now, you notice I haven't told you it doesn't exist.

No, no, I haven't found somebody that because he was a member of the Planet Builders eight—you get the idea—eight trillion years ago—he obviously was a Release then—I haven't found his TA stuck up because of that whole track release. Do you understand? I don't say it can't exist, but I do say I haven't found it. I've found them all in this lifetime so far. Got it?

Male voice: Thank you for that.

All right. You got that one real good? Is there anything misunderstood about it? Any question about it? Hm?

Audience: No.

Nope?

Female voice: Yeah, I have a question.

Yes?

Female voice: That exact thing happened with me this morning.

Well, you overran something, but it probably wasn't what you were running.

Female voice: No.

Do you follow?

Female voice: Yes.

All right, now, let's take number two, and this is the main thing I want to talk to you about: A rolly coaster equals a suppressive person in that person's vicinity. In other words, rolly coaster—PTS. If a person rolly coasters, it's PTS. A PTS is a connection with a suppressive. I'll give you the exact mechanics of it; I'll let you sort them out on your own time.

And that's postulat-counter-postulate is the anatomy of a problem. And this belongs in actual fact at Grade I. And it's just this: postulate-counter-postulate. Postulate versus postulate. That is the definition and the anatomy of a problem. And there is *no* other definition to a problem. There can be several counter-postulates; there can be several going out like this, but that makes several problems. The central problem is always postulate-counter-postulate.

So the guy has had a purpose in life and somebody has suppressed it, or a guy has had a purpose over a twenty-four-hour period and somebody suppressed that purpose. In other words, his purpose was his postulate, the other person saying he couldn't do it was the counter-postulate. Do you follow?

So that is simply the anatomy of a problem and it belongs at Grade I. And there is *no other reason* for rolly coaster. This is the "no other" data I'm giving you. There just is no other datum.

People don't rolly coaster because they got into an engram. People don't rolly coaster because the auditor misread the action. People don't rolly coaster because his father was a Methodist and has been dead since birth. Do you understand? So don't, as a Review Auditor, ever fall for two seconds for any other reason for a rolly coaster than postulate-counter-postulate. There isn't any other reason.

Now, SP is a version of this. It's a version of a problem and is a specialized kind of problem, and that is what causes the rolly coaster. The individual has run into a postulate-counter-postulate since his last improvement, which makes him a potential trouble source.

Potential trouble source means the case is going to go up and fall down. And he's a trouble source because he's going to get upset. He's a trouble source because he's going to make trouble. And he's a trouble for the auditor and he's trouble for us and he's trouble for himself and so forth. And he really does make trouble. That's very carefully named.

The SP isn't making trouble. See? He's just poisoning the whole universe, you know? But it isn't—he isn't making trouble; he's just going *squash!* Do you see? Anybody says anything to him—*squash!* You see? It's the PTS who makes the trouble. Do you see this?

Now, this is the whole backbone of ethics. And there isn't anything more to ethics than the—this basic purpose of ethics is ethics exists to get tech in. If you ever see ethics being put in that throws tech out, then ethics is being used in a suppressive fashion. Now, the only way that you could use ethics suppressively is use it in such a way that it threw tech out. Because the purpose of ethics is to put tech in. If you've got ethics, you can get tech in. You carry on ethics long enough to get tech in, and that's all the longer you carry it. But in the process of getting tech in you very often will run into a rolly coaster—and that is, a case worsens after it improves, as easily as that.

The case did all right in yesterday's session; comes to this session, falls on his head. That's a rolly coaster. And there's no other cause for it, see, than postulate-counter-postulate.

You'll see a process come out and an HCOB come out on a process that will be called "Search and Discovery." And Search and Discovery is just to find the purposes—to find the suppressions the

person has had in life. And one of the broad ways of finding it, unfortunately, will make a Problems Release in minutes. You say, "What has been your main purpose in life? Thank you very much. Who opposed it? Thank you very much." And in a large percentage of cases, Problems Release! Do you understand? It'd be an interesting percentage on which this would occur.

Of course, the person doesn't know about problems—they aren't cleaned up about problems worth a nickel—but they'll go release on the subject of problems, and they'll stay released. And now you try to run problems on them and you're going to get a high TA. Do you see? They've solved all their problems.

The way you solve a problem is to find the source of the counter-postulate. You find the source of the counter-postulate; that's the way to solve a problem. Now, man gets *solutions* to problems. In other words, he leaves the counter-postulate and his own postulate in place, not knowing the definition of a problem, and then solves the resulting collision, as in dialectic materialism.

You want to read that some day; that's very interesting. It's the anatomy of a problem gone mad. 'Any idea is the product of two forces' is the backbone of it. It's quite interesting. It's the—it's a current philosophy. But in actual fact, that's based on a problem. Two forces going together make a squash, so therefore, that's it!

Now, if you want to really solve a problem and see it solve in the physical universe and have an awful lot of fun with it, then you had certainly better look over the whole perimeter of counter-postulates: What is the source of the problem?

And if you hit it right—if you've got a problem with Joe Jinks and he's in Toronto, Canada—if you hit it right, don't be surprised if you get a phone call from Joe Jinks telling you the problem is all solved. It happens, routinely and constantly. And I had to run down what process was it that was causing this phenomena, because we ran into the problem very often.

We'd run Problems of Comparable Magnitude on a pc in an HGC or an ACC or something like this, and the next thing you know their long-lost husband or something, that they'd had such awful problems with, is very sweetness and light. Do you follow? You see, the problem evaporated. But the funny part of it is, in the physical universe it'll also evaporate for the other person sometimes. So that's quite interesting. And that's very interesting for you to know that in connection with ethics. Because when you see that the disconnection, or the handle or disconnect, causes an enormous problem for the person or for the other person from whom they are disconnecting, you have *invariably* found the wrong person.

Now, Ethics... The policy letter that moved them over to "Suppressives must be located by Review"—and that's where you're coming in and that's why I'm talking to you. We're not permitting Ethics, anymore, to locate suppressive persons. They're going to be located by Review Auditors in regular session. Do you see that? Because Ethics just flubs it too often. They're not equipped for auditing and so forth. They're interested in justice and that sort of thing, and they don't go ahead with it and do a good job of it. So therefore, anybody walking into Ethics who is PTS, who has roly coastered and so forth, is sent to Review. And that is the route.

Actually, an HGC auditor should send directly to Review and then Review sends to Ethics. Ethics has to have some notation of this. That's the only reason they go to Ethics after Review. Do you see? Because when they're sent to—when somebody says, "Well, this person is PTS," and so forth, you *could* send them directly, don't you see, over to Ethics and *then* to Review in all cases. But I know very well that if one of your Examiners was to find a PTS, and know very well that that Examiner would inevitably and invariably send that person directly to Review, wouldn't send them to Ethics. Why? Review is closer. Do you see?

So after the person has been found to rolly coaster and then Review cleans up the SP why, they can go over to Ethics and get a statement of handle or declare, don't you see? But it's all cleaned up. They're not any longer—they're not even vaguely worried about it. Do you see?

Now, that's the way it's going to be handled, and that's the change of route. So therefore I'm briefing you. And the reason why I've called you in is just to give you this datum and just tell you that although around you will hear occasionally there are other reasons for rolly coaster, that's for the birds! That's not true. There are no other reasons for rolly coaster than PTS. And PTS is the manifestation of a postulate-counter-postulate.

Now, you notice that I haven't said how long. You know, the person didn't have to be a PTS for two and a half years before he became up to Review's attention—I mean, up to the attention of Ethics. He might have only been PTS for twenty minutes. And it's very interesting that you can overrun a person who is trying to tell you he's already gone Release and the person becomes a PTS. Who's the suppressive?

Audience: The auditor.

Isn't that interesting? Of course, the suppressive—it's merely a suppressive action. You don't declare the auditor a suppressive person. Do you follow? You don't have to then go through the endless action of "the Pc must separate from the auditor and disconnect and..." That's a lot of balderdash, isn't it? But still, the mechanics are there: rolly coaster—PTS. Well, just who? Where? How? What? And that's your job in Review.

Now, you can use listing. You can list the person's purposes: "What purpose of yours has been thwarted?" I mean, unfortunately, in handling this you're going to have some Releases on your hands. But watch it! Get them declared when they occur; that's a Grade I Release.

Now, don't let somebody shake you off of this datum that a rolly coaster is a PTS. And the definition of PTS is: connected to a suppressive person or action. See? Person or action. A guy can inadvertently suppress something. You're driving down the road and somebody steps out in front of your car—believe me, when you hit him, you suppressed him. You certainly didn't intend to and that doesn't make you a suppressive person. Do you follow?

So just looking at this from straight technical mechanics and so forth: a rolly coaster—PTS. Now, if that PTS is not handled the person does become, then, a trouble source. And "PTS"—very well named. You overrun somebody, oh boy, you're going to have trouble. They're going to make trouble. There's going to be all kinds of trouble.

What's your main consideration, then, in handling anybody sent to you from Ethics or from the HGC, in the review? Your main consideration is, promptly and immediately, this person has been up against a suppressive action or person. And don't go nutty and try to do ARC breaks on him and sympathize with how badly they've been hit. Nothing like that. All you've got to do is find the suppressive person. Now, the person may only have been suppressive for five minutes. Or the person might have been suppressive for a lifetime. But you find the right one and instantly the good indicators will come in, and watch it, because you're liable to make a Release right at that moment.

Now, also watch it that by getting off the SP you rehabilitate the state of Release which was being overrun. You see now, the person came in to you with a high TA, and all of a sudden you recognize the person is PTS, also. Do you follow? Person felt better, now feels worse. Well, your action is to locate the suppressive action or person, of course. But you might have the high TA because the person has had an overrun on a process. But it's still a suppressive action. See, completely aside from rehabilitating the process, what have you got?

Now, a suppressive person is not somebody with horns; it's a person who has had a counter-postulate to the PC you are handling. But a suppressive person who is routinely suppressive in life, invalidative of Scientology and trying to keep people from getting well and that sort of thing, is a social menace.

Now, he's the problem of Ethics. Your problem in Review is to find him. And if it's just a momentary suppression and so forth, you don't go declaring somebody suppressive because he accidentally overran the PC, and the PC says, "I feel good now and I don't want to answer any more auditing commands."

"Well, you'd better answer this next auditing command."

"Well, I don't *want* to answer any more auditing commands."

"Well, you'd *better* answer this next auditing command."

The person will now behave to some degree on the basis of PTS. You not only have got an overrun release, or something of that sort is lurking around there, but you in addition to that have a PTS. Do you follow? So both of those actions would have to be handled. But please, please don't let somebody shake this datum for you. Because when they can't find the SP by any means, then they will drop the datum. Do you see? They drop the datum, huh? They say, "Well, all right. It was because he ate bananas last night."

Well, I'm afraid that somebody in auditing wouldn't roly coaster if he just ate some bad bananas last night. He's not roller coastering in auditing. So he doesn't feel so well this morning; well, he knows damn well what did it. If he wanted to—if you wanted to be an absolute perfectionist on this, you could say, "Well, who insisted you eat the bananas?" Don't you see? And probably at that moment, why, his tummyache would go (*snap!*).

But that sort of thing is too minor. We're talking about a real honest-to-God roly coaster, see? The person was doing fine in the—audited in London, doing fine; appears here, doing badly. Oh boy, that's a roly coaster. He signs all over the wall, that's roly coaster. Don't you see? Did all right last week; isn't doing well this week. Well, that's a roly coaster. And always there is a suppressive action or person—invariably, inevitably. And Review's job, then, when somebody sends to Review a PTS, is to find that.

Now, Review also, as I told you, might find also an overrun—may find two things while looking for one. And the only mistake you can make is, two things being present, find the wrong one and say the person is now okay, when the other one still has to be handled. See, you'd handle both of them. If two things are wrong, you'd handle both things—if the person has had an overrun and is also a PTS from some other course—or source.

Now, you'll notice that whenever you tell a person the right suppressive, that's like locating, indicating the bypassed charge. It isn't the same as an ARC break. Don't get it tangled with an ARC break, because an ARC break is only cycles of communication. That's another animal. And you can't handle these things. But the funny part of it is, the same technology will locate and indicate the suppressive—source of the suppression—locate what it is, get the pc to look it over, indicate what it is. You should get good indicators. And you should get them right now, and your meter ought to blow down. And it's unmistakable.

And now if the person again roly coasters, don't say, "We didn't find the right suppressive." There's another one, that's all. It's that simple. You got—you did this and the good indicators all came in. The person felt fine for three days and all of a sudden roly coasters again, and you have the person back on your hands. Don't let anybody berate you. And you, John, as Qual Sec, don't let anybody

start berating Qual for not having found the right suppressive. Do you see? This person was infested. You see? Just find it. You say, "Aw, *poo-phoo-phoo wuffiwuff* nothing, *bah-bah-bah*. There was just another suppressive to be found, that's all." And go ahead and do so.

If you found all the suppressive persons and actions in a person's lifetime you would have a Problems Release. And sometimes, as I said to you, and all too often, the Problems Release will occur while you're looking for it. And after that, you're up the creek, aren't you? How, now, are you going to handle this when the person gets into another PTS situation? Well, don't let it worry you, because he's a Release on the subject and he won't. Unless he goes home and starts self-auditing it.

Now, let me give you another little point on overrun here—just a point in question, so forth. You know you have auditors around who self-audit and that a person can be released and then they're so anxious to get to the next grade of Release that they dicker around and tinker around with whatever they're doing. And then they think, "That was a good command the auditor was running," and then *they* overrun it.

They actually will give themselves repetitive auditing commands. I'm calling that to your attention. And it is a source of overrun which is all too often overlooked. There can be, in a trained Scientologist, another auditor present: the pc as an auditor, auditing himself. He's liable to go home—ARC breaks: "Oh, gee, I felt so wonderful after Aunt Molly..." and so forth, and he hasn't quite blown it all, don't you see? And he sits down and he says, "Let me see, was there anything else that Aunt Molly invalidated me about? Oh yes, that. And somebody else invalidated me about..." Now, it's going to run, for a very short distance. And then his TA is going to go high, and he's going to have a high TA. Do you see that? It's a hidden source of an overrun.

All right. But this rolly coaster, suppressive, PTP of long duration is the one which gives Ethics the most trouble, and it's being handed over as an auditing proposition to Review. And one of the reasons it's being handed over is I've solved the technology of it and there isn't anything more to the technology of it than I've just given you. And you can fancy this up any way you please. You can run fifty dozen different processes to solve the same thing. You could tailor-make all kinds of one-two-threes and that sort of thing. But it's just postulate-counter-postulate. It's just an effort to act versus an effort to—not to act. It's this, you see? It's just postulate-counter-postulate.

You spot the source of the counter-postulate and that will be the end of the problem. And that's the piece of technology that's just come up, and I think you'll admit that's ter—it's so plainly stated that you're sure I have said it before. And I haven't said it in that two connected words.

All right. Now, the other thing has nothing much to do with those two, but it is the source of the overt. And the source of the overt is that formula whereby when something is misunderstood, a person will then individuate from it and then he will commit overt acts against it. And that is the cycle. There's a longer cycle than that; you'll find it in bulletins; it's already been covered. But this is the third datum which is a key, top-flight senior datum that is most commonly overlooked.

Confusion or argumentation, upset or stupidity, comes from a misunderstood word, misunderstood *earlier* than the one the person is talking about. The word that is misunderstood is always *earlier* than the one the person is nattering about. That's *always* the case, and that's part of the original study materials. But it's just uniformly missed.

Student is having a hard time out here arguing with the Supervisor—yip, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap, yap. The Supervisor will just stand there and argue about what the student is arguing about. They'll go on arguing and arguing and arguing. And they bring them over and come into Review and Cramming and so forth. And they go on arguing, arguing, arguing—oh bull! This is *terrible!* Because in the first place, how did the Supervisor not know this other part of the datum? It's always earlier than the one they're arguing about.

If they're arguing about a point in paragraph two that the student can't understand, then the missing point is in paragraph one, always. And the student will never argue about paragraph one, and he'll always argue about paragraph two. Do you see that? And the misunderstood word is in paragraph one. Do you follow?

All right. If halfway through a course they're very upset and they can't understand their material and they're being very, very stupid, then there was something in the very early part of the course that they're not discussing at all. And this is always the case! The person *never spots* what they've misunderstood!

So any confusion, stupidity or upset from the level of training always comes from a word misunderstood or a misunderstood thing, *prior* to the one the person insists on talking about. It's always *prior* to the one the guy is talking about. And to talk to him about what he is talking about is just a *waste of time*. And as a Review Auditor you get this, every once in a while.

You get—have to do an assist on a student of some kind or another. And hell say, "Well—" and you'll say, "Well, what didn't you understand?" (I'll show you how to do this wrong.) "What didn't you understand?"

"Oh, why, I didn't understand—uh—I just couldn't understand about engrams. They just—just—oh, they're very upsetting. I couldn't understand anything about them."

"Well, was there some word in the connection with engrams that you didn't know?"

Flunk! Flunk! Flunk! Flunk! You get it? The auditor is saying, "What word connected with engrams didn't you understand?" Or the auditor says, "Well, he didn't get the definition of engrams." Do you see, this is just flunk, flunk, flunk, flunk. Guy doesn't know what he misunderstood. It's before he went into engrams.

And you say, 'All right...'" Now, the pat question, if you want to solve this (*snap*) right like that, is, "Just before you got into engrams, what was there that you collided with that you didn't dig?"

"Oh! Oh, that. Locks. I just didn't understand what a lock was or what—what—what is this thing called a picture?"

All of a sudden, *bing-bang*, now he understands it, and that's all there is to it. Do you follow? And the magic of the whole thing is spotting the earlier misunderstood thing from the one he is talking about. And that is implicit in the study materials themselves, but is the key major point and is the solution to it, and is the one which is consistently missed in Tech, it's missed in Ethics, it's missed all over the organization. It's missed in checkouts. It's just missed in a rash. And when the guy has missed all the way across the boards, he inevitably will wind up sooner or later in Review to get this handled or to get handled some way or another, because he will get routed down there.

Now, he very often will get routed there from Cramming. See? Cramming will get fed up with this guy and send him over for some auditing, don't you see? Now, *that's* all you do with him. Now, you can run the form 26 June on him, and you can do a lot of other things, but *this* is the one you do with him. This is the key datum. This is senior to everything else that you can do.

Now, these first two I've given you rank this way: The first one ranks as exclusively an auditing activity—high TA equals overrun.

The second one, roly coaster and suppressive and so forth—that is really, exclusively an environmental difficulty. Do you understand? And it can occasionally incur in auditing. You'll err when you think it always occurs in auditing. But that's really environmental, don't you see?

And this next one is on the subject of comprehension of Scientology materials, and that's where they relate. And they are the key datum to each one of these activities. In other words, "high TA equals overrun"; that is the key datum of auditing. Because that's the one that can wreck all auditing. So therefore, it obviously is the boss datum.

And the second one, this can wreck a guy's whole life: PTS. And if that's not discovered and so forth... And that's the key datum that regulates the environment.

And this third one is the one that regulates his comprehension, not only of Scientology but of existence. See, that's the key datum that regulates his IQ. And that is the boss datum. That is the top dog, right there. That's the one way up on top. And it's so easy to get it wrong! It is just so simple to get this wrong.

"Oh! The reason the guy is arguing with me is misunderstood a word." That's wrong! That is a totally improper statement and it won't lead to a resolution of the problem. Do you understand? That's a false datum!

"There is a misunderstood word in what the guy is arguing with me about," and that is false. From the standpoint of a Review Auditor, that has not sufficient truth to resolve the situation. That's wrong! The correct datum is "There is something misunderstood just *before* what he's talking about." That's the correct datum and that's the one that leads to a resolution of the situation.

Guy's talking about steam engines: "Well, I just never dug any steam engines. Steam eng-*aw-blah!* Ifs a terrible subject. I just hate steam engines and so forth. Never could understand anything about them, I'm always having accidents with them, and so forth, even though I own the B&O Railroad. Ah, yeah, steam engines and so forth."

Well, an auditor who'd say to him at that moment, "What word have you misunderstood about steam engines?" just has missed the whole boat. That's why the datum won't work.

Female voice: Sure, if that was the problem, it would resolve.

Yes! The guy's trying to understand steam engines. He isn't confused about steam engines. "Just before you got into steam engines, what did you misunderstand? What did you find incomprehensible just before you got into steam engines? What were you in just before you got into steam engines?"

Let's take it on a terribly broad basis, see? "What were you in just before you got into steam engines?"

"History."

And you'll find out that his misunderstanding comes into the basis of politics. And railroads, after that, you see, is a secondary subject that has to do with the political expansion of continents or something. And he's all hung up in the subject of politics, and he doesn't think people ought to drive other people off continents or something, see? It's that wild. So he moves into this whole field of steam engines and he doesn't understand anything about steam engines. Steam engines were the source and cause of a lot of things he doesn't comprehend—anything about it. There's an allied subject he was in just before he got there. Do you follow? I'm giving you a ridiculously broad example. Do you understand?

So this auditor out here, he's saying, "I just don't understand anything." He'll keep saying, "Mind? Mind? Now, what do you mean by mind?" I mean, it's this boy on course, see. "What do you mean by mind? I don't understand anything about mind." All right. His Supervisor stands there and defines mind for him and goes into all kinds of gesticulations and explanations and graphs on the board about... Honest-to-Pete, he could do this probably for the next century without ever getting his point across. You got it? He could go on and on and on.

"Just before you got upset about minds, what were you into? What were you studying just before you got to that point about minds?" That's the right question.

"Oh, I don't remember... Oh, yes I do. Yes. Yes, I—I—I do. Yes, there is something there—religion." And he'll be hung up on a completely different subject, and he's never spotted it, and you've got to actually take his wits and back him up on the time track. Do you understand? So that your Review Auditor action is always realizing that the remainder of the org possibly has not got this one straight: that it's the earlier one. If there's *anything* wrong with a guy's study, then this is the thing that is wrong. They have not backed it up one.

They're arguing about bulletin three, when it's bulletin two, see? They're arguing about paragraph seven when it's paragraph six. It's always—they're arguing about the one after when the fault is the one before. You got that?

And your Review action, then, becomes unstabilized to the degree that you don't find a misdefinition in what he is studying. You don't find the misdefinition in what he is studying and therefore you think his stupidity comes from some end word or something. You see, you'll change your mind; you'll think the study datum is gone; you'll start looking elsewhere for the reason why. Well, the magic is all connected in: If it doesn't resolve on what you ask him, it's before what you ask him. It's the one he's arguing about and telling you all about that he didn't understand and so forth, then he didn't dig something just ahead of it. And as a Review Auditor, when you get this boy from Cramming or from course or something like this, you *must* back it up.

"Well," he's saying, "the au—these Instructors, these Supervisors, they just won't listen to me. And I keep telling them and telling them and telling them that I just can't understand an E-Meter."

"What were you studying with regard to E-Meters?"

"Well, I was studying the E-Meter book of E-Meters."

'All right. Now, is there something in the very early portion of that book. . .—this is possible, but not too probable—"Is there something in the very early portion of that book you didn't dig?"

Well, clean up a couple. See, it's like unburdening the time track. "Well, there's... All right. Is there something just before you got into E-Meters? Is there something before you got into E-Meters?" You could find possibly that it's the word *essentials*. He didn't understand *essentials*—you know, *E-Meter Essentials*. It's that early in the book. But the probability is it's something that predates E-Meters. It predates his study of E-Meters. And therefore you've got to follow that down.

Whatever it is, it'll read on your meter. Do you know that you can date it before you find it? You can say, "All right, you're having an awful time learning E-Meters. You've been checked out on 850 GAEs on the subject of E-Meters here in your last three weeks of auditing." His ethics file is thick with these things. All right. Now, I'll give you the wrong question: "What don't you understand about E-Meters?" Wrong question! Won't lead to a resolution. It'll lead to an argument; it'll lead to some tiny, partial result; it has no magic connected with it.

You say the right question: "The date of the misunderstanding that's got you upset about E-Meters: 1964? 1963? Is it before 1960? Is it after 1960?" You could do it as crazy as this. All of a sudden you get a read. And that was 1962. He says, "Well, I wasn't even in Scientology."

"All right, what were you in?"

"Well, I sold books in a bookstore."

And you'll find a dictionary fell on his foot or something of the sort. And at the moment that it fell on his foot he was looking up meters or he was looking up electronic devices. Or he was once an electrical engine—he wanted to be an electrical engineer when he was a child, and he'd forgotten all about this, but his parents wouldn't permit him to be an electrical engineer. Now he doesn't understand about *anything* electrical. Has nothing to do with meters. Do you find that? And you can plow around this way, but for heaven's sakes don't plow around on what the PC is arguing with. And that's my whole message.

The absolutely fixed datum here is it's *always* a misunderstood word and it is always prior to the one the PC is arguing about. And if you've got that, boy, can you handle cases on a Review basis on stupid students. *Whoosh, whoosh, whoosh*—there's nothing to it. It just rolls off pocketa-pocketa-pocketa. Guy walks in, so on. There isn't anything else, by the way, wrong with a student. See, that's how senior the datum is. If you use this datum you'll find the other things wrong with the student just fall away; they're all apparencies, they're all locks on what this is, you see?

You can find a lot of things wrong with a student. You could find a lot of arguments he's having. You can find a lot of upsets he's having. You can find injustices. You can find all sorts of wild things, and so forth. But if he isn't making progress in his studies, then the thing is wrong with his studies, isn't it? You don't handle his environment so that he can handle his studies better. Let me give you that as a datum.

I've been so knocked out and dragged down and so forth, casewise and otherwise and otherwises, don't you see, that I couldn't see two feet away. And the funny part of it is, I could always work on technology. You normally find in existence, the thing the person is having trouble with will resolve if you find out what caused it. And if it doesn't resolve, then you haven't found out what caused it.

But this datum about study it—don't buy any guff off the student. Don't buy any bunch of different solutions. Let him get them off; let him get off some ARC breaks. Acknowledge him. Locate and indicate the bypassed charge of somebody who wouldn't listen to him about his not understanding things or... I don't care what you do—but realize, please—make him happy for sure—but realize, please, that you're just—that you're just flicking at the froth on the beer. You're not taking any drinks of beer.

You can do all the things you want to; you can putter around for hours. You can make him feel pretty good, you can get him into good communication with you, all this sort of thing and so forth. And then you jolly well better find out what he misunderstood *before* what he said he misunderstood.

You say, "What have you misunderstood about all this?" And the guy says, "Well, I don't understand buttercakes." And you say, "Well, that's good." Don't ever make the fatal mistake of saying, "What don't you understand about buttercakes?" If he's got buttercakes pinpointed that easy, he doesn't misunderstand buttercakes. It's cooks. It's something just ahead of buttercakes. And your right auditing question is 'All right. Well, just before you got into the subject of buttercakes and so forth, what were you into?'

Guy says, "That's a new thought!" See, he'll give you the basic on the chain, don't you see? Well, I don't care how far down you follow the basic on the chain. After all, Review auditing is paid auditing. Follow it down to the year izzard, but don't follow it into the R6 bank. Got it?

I don't care how many study points you cure up with this bird. But remember, you are handling fringes on end words and that sort of thing. I don't care how many points you relieve; I don't care if you clean up his kindergarten. You understand? It's almost a deliberate anti-Q and A. He says it's B—well, don't ARC break him—say, "Oh, yes..." cheerily, cheerily, "Yeah, oh yeah, good. I'm glad you don't understand buttercake." But now give him A. 'All right, just before you got into buttercake, what was it?"

"Oh!"

You're going to get some big cognitions and you'll get some big results. You got it?

All right, to summarize up here—to summarize up—you got three data, and it's the three data that go out in the org. And that's why they're key data for Review. These three data go out in the org. The org in general has many other data which they consider very important. And how to run E-Meters and that sort of thing—these data are very important. And how to do Power Processing and everything—these things are very important. You understand? But from the viewpoint of Review, there are really only three data that are important. Only three.

And one of those is a high TA equals overrun. And if you know that, boy, you're never going to have any trouble. When was it overrun; what was overrun?

Two: If a person roly coasters, he is a PTS, at that moment. He is a PTS and it's only a question of what was the source of the suppressive action? Do you see? That's the counter-postulate. Just get that counter-postulate, that's all. Who? It's not, by the way, good enough to get the counter-postulate. You've got to get, if you can, the source of the counter-postulate. The reason the R6 bank, for instance, doesn't blow, is because you don't get the counter-postulate—*who* on the counter-postulate. You can get all the counter-postulates—but who? That doesn't emerge till way late, don't you see?

You'll find the most difficult problems that you handle on an individual is he never found out who. He walked out his front doorstep and all of a sudden he had a bullet through his head and he never found out who shot him. He'll be hung up on the track for centuries. See? Who was the other fellow? And he goes around asking this question rather haunted.

Next one: Confusion of any sort comes from a misunderstood word that goes before the word the person is arguing about.

That's the whole lot.

Now, you could ask me for a whole bunch of fancy processes, one of which to handle each one, and I could probably be very amusing and be very interesting. I am going to write one called "Search and Discovery" and give several alternate methods of finding the SP, and so forth, that mostly consist of listing or just asking or something like that. But actually, if you're a skilled auditor you should be able to do these.

Now, with the routing: for any auditing action required in Ethics, we're for sure going to send that person right straight to the Qual Div and the Department of Review. And no analysis of this particular character is going to be done in Ethics of any kind whatsoever. They just do nothing but make mistakes.

Oh, they spot one every once in a while and straighten a lot of thing up; I shouldn't invalidate them 100 percent. But there's too many mistakes, too many mistakes. And those mistakes have one common denominator. The mistakes Ethics makes are in actual fact failure to spot the proper SP or source of the suppressive actions. And that is the big mistake. Because if Ethics spotted that mistake every time, then everyone would be very happy with Ethics.

And it's interesting that in the policy letter, the person is not permitted, if he's gone for an ethics action on this, PTS, he's actually not permitted to be trained or processed till he's paid for his Review auditing. Now, you'll say, "Boy, that is sure commercial. Oh, that's really commercial." No, I have found uniformly that if a person won't pay—actually the pennies and pence—for Review auditing, they didn't get it in Review. The person is usually so happy—if the person has really been handled in Review, he's so happy about it, he would actually push somebody out of his road to go over there and put down the quid or two that was necessary to handle his little bill. Do you follow?

But if he won't pay that, I can assure you that it hasn't been located. So it's just a preventer, don't you see?