

## R3SC

A lecture given on  
3 September 1963

What is the well-known date?

Audience: September 3rd, A . D. 13.

3 September A.D. 13, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course. And we have a lecture on R3SC.

Notice, Moms no hands. No papers, no notes. Cold, like that!

All right. Now, once upon a time we had something called a rock slammer. You remember the history of a rock slammer? All right.

You did a Scientology List One, which is not the L1 in that bulletin, but the old Scientology List One. And what did you find in this? You found that occasionally as you went down the line you picked up a tick, and when you put in the big mid ruds on that particular tick, you all of a sudden got yourself a nice, handsome rock slam. So you say “auditing” to somebody and you got a rock slam, right?

You remember this technology? Well, this meant that something was going to go wrong in the vicinity of auditing with regard to this person, by reason of aberration.

Now, of course, punitively, punitively, we said at once all rock slammers were bad, and they all ought to be shot, and so forth, until we found out that practically everybody rock-slammed. And then, of course, we had to come off of it. But that isn't all that we came off of. We just dropped that piece of know-how in the mire and let it lie. You notice suddenly we weren't saying anything about that at all.

Well, that didn't mean that I forgot it, completely. That didn't mean that it was utterly gone as far as I was concerned. But I had seen some phenomena which I definitely had to straighten out. And that phenomena had to do with the reason a person doesn't recover under auditing. Now, that's the whole department head; that heads up that whole department: the reason the person doesn't recover under auditing.

Now, this has been with us, actually, since 1949, 1948. It must have been present then. I didn't run into it head-on until about 1950, and it became very crucial in 1950. One of the reasons this would peak up is that in the type of auditing which I was doing in 1950 there was a great deal of slippiness. A lot of it was very slippy. And there was a lot of this and that would work its way through, and you didn't have a hard, tightly bound process, you see? And as soon as you got a tightly bound process that was limited to running of engrams, you ran into this phenomenon of people not getting well. So again we have run into engrams and again we all of a sudden come up with this interesting datum—but not for the same reason—of people who just don't recover.

Now, in my catalog of things to be done, this business of rock slammers and reasons why people didn't get well continued to ride right along there and take a prominent position in looking over all new things.

And all of a sudden I collided with the old service facsimile. But the collide was rather oblique. And the way we collided with that was by a study of the tone arm, the necessity to get tone arm motion and the various positions of the tone arm.

Now, all of that material which you've had in a recent lecture very germane to this. It became obvious that if an individual were audited for three sessions without tone arm action, he got

into pretty terrible condition. Bad. Bad show. Bad show. Therefore, you had to audit with tone arm action.

I don't say he fell to pieces, but he just wasn't feeling well—he didn't feel so good. You'd find his session goals became gloomier and gloomier. In other words, you could predict any time that a case was going to feel not so good by noting that he had no tone arm action during the session you had just run. And this I tested out. And I tested this out. I watched it, coordinated it and so forth —no vast series of cases but that wasn't necessary. I had a considerable background on all this material.

Now, there we are: person gets no TA action during a session, person doesn't feel so good. Three sessions—they feel pretty wog. No TA action. So we mustn't run without TA action. So it became very, very important to find out what was stopping TA action. And there are several reasons why TA actions stop. The basic reasons are still those; all the reasons I have given there are very valid reasons. But they fall away from the very high theoretical to the very easily applied practical aspect of it. And the practical aspect of it indicated just this: that an individual would release charge or an individual wouldn't release charge. And that's about all it came down to.

Now, that you are getting—now get these slight divisions here: that you are getting tone arm action does not guarantee that your PC will feel better. Now, that is one for you there. Doesn't guarantee your PC is going to feel better. But getting no TA action guarantees that your PC is going to feel worse. Do you see that, see? So you haven't got quite a yes or no.

Now, why the individual who gets TA action doesn't necessarily feel better is contained in restimulation and overrestimulation. The individual is overrestimulated: the restimulation is too high and yet the charge is still releasing. Now, that's quite interesting there. You've got maybe fifteen sources of charge that can be released, and they're all in restimulation. And you're only running one of them, so you're releasing charge off of that one.

Let your PC's attention wander off of what you are running and you instantly have added more restimulation to the case. All you have to do is be a clumsy auditor at Level IV auditing on the itsa line and you've had it.

Now, let's grade up auditors here—let's grade up auditors. just in passing. I: Well, we just leave it on accident whether the guy gets TA action or not. We hope he gets TA action, see—Class I. We just hope he does. And it's not going to endanger anybody very much because the fundamental questions that they're being asked are very un-fundamental. They're being asked how they cured their lumbosis or something of the sort. All right, so they don't get TA action. So the guy gets a percentage of wins and he gets a percentage of loses, and we just hope the percentage of wins that the auditor gets at that level are greater than the percentage of loses, and that he doesn't get discouraged about it all, and so forth. We just hope, you understand? Because frankly, at that level of training, we can't do anything else. See, it's—look at the amount of technical material which goes into this and you see at once that it's too formidable. This guy would go on—he'd have to go on for months or years of training before he would come up to being able to cope with that situation.

Well, it's a very small price to pay. Because the funny part of it is, now with the itsa line, we can take that chance very nicely and come out with, a great deal of percentage of wins. But you recognize that the auditor at that level is taking that chance that he's going to run some sessions without TA action. He's going to listen to a lot of natter and he's going to listen to this and he's going to listen to that. And he's going to get a certain number of service facsimile-type cases that don't get TA action, you see; he's not going to get any TA action. And this isn't seriously going to put somebody in the hospital or anything like that, because the process isn't that strong, don't you see? But it's going to be the guy just doesn't really think auditing is getting him anyplace—that sort of thing, you know? And he just feels gloomier than he would ordinarily feel, and so on.

Well, what's happening with all this? Well, we can't expect at the level of training of Class I for the auditor to be able to remedy it. And of course the second that you, instructing auditors and so forth, come back to remedy this situation, you are no longer operating in the zone or area of Class I and you are actually trying to make a Class II auditor. So you see, that still stays with the definition.

You start saying to this guy—the moment you start saying to this guy, “Hey, for God's sakes! Read those rules, man, read those rules in that RIC. Read 'em! You're asking this person for problems, problems, problems—what problems have they had in life? And what have they been trying to solve in life? That's a backwards question, a backwards question, man! Of course that TA is going to stick.” You know? Well, you're working on Class II, see, straight away. See? So, you see, the condition still remains as it is in Class I, which is a relatively uninstructed auditor.

All right. Now, we move up into Class II: we get “with tone arm action.” And the way we handle it there is actually not with the change and shift of processes, beyond just altering the question a bit. But we get listening with tone arm action, and that means that a certain amount of direction of attention is going to have to be done, even if it's just directed by the question that is being asked. “What have you done about your lumbosis?” See? Now, he's supposed to know the rules of what not to ask, and so on, and to get TA action, and he's got some various ramifications there that are pretty good. And he can do some things in this line, but it's very light attention direction, don't you see very light indeed. In fact, we don't even instruct him to direct attention; we rather tend to instruct him not to direct attention. For instance, “Don't drop the E-Meter,” you see?

All right, we get up to Class III and what have we got? What have we got at Class III? We've got a direction of attention at Class Level III toward service facsimiles and the state of Clear. Now we're starting to drop out this endless, wandering its a line, don't you see? We're starting to clip this guy for letting the PC's attention wander off too far into other subject matter. We're supposed—that auditor at the level of m is supposed to be able to control the PC's attention to keep the PC's attention on what the PC is supposed to be talking about We get—the limitation of attention is what enters in here, see, to some degree. We start telling the fellow, “Now, don't let this PC start wandering around on the early track. And don't do this and don't do that; and keep the PC's attention centered on what you're trying to run and don't let the PC's attention wander over into his environmental restimulation. And if it is there, clean it up with since mid ruds.” See, at this level we're using mid ruds; we're knocking down environmental attention. We're paying a lot of attention to the PC's attention at Class Level III.

Now, that control of the PC's attention is at a very high high, you see, there at III. That's pretty high, now. This PC is really being put in the groove.

This PC is supposed to talk about A and B and his attention is supposed to be freed up from C and D so that he will talk about A and B. You get the idea? In other words, here's control—control of attention here is getting rather heavy. That's fine, has to be.

Now, let's take Class Level IV: Man, you're living with the lightning now. You've got this PC on a backtrack. You've got this PC there. You've got him on stuff that is quite overwhelming. All he has to do is skid around inside the GPM. All he's got to do is say “Let me go back up and pick up those two early items that we missed.” Zzzzzp!—and he throws forty RIs into restimulation. Why? Because he had to walk through forty RIs to pick it up that are only—you see—that are not properly discharged. All right, that isn't so bad, you see?

“Let me repair . . . Oh, I see what this item is. Let me repair it in the earlier goal...” And then, much to your embarrassment, you have missed a GPM between these two goals, and he returns up to the earlier goal and throws a whole GPM into restimulation, consisting of some 230 items in the Helatrobos. Eeerk! Look, you're walking across Grand Canyon on a wire one millimeter thick.

Now, if you see the various classes in terms of expertness of control of the PC's attention, all will start to make sense to you on the subject of these classes. If you only see these on the complexity of the information the auditor has, auditing will not occur. Oh, well, yeah, you know all about GPMs and you know all about engrams, you know all about processes, you know all about this and you know all about that, and therefore you're Class IV. No, no, no, no. There could be that one element missing—that one element missing: control the PC's attention with expertise—and you would not have a Class IV auditor.

Now, you start letting a PC talk, you start putting in the itsa line on the backtrack. Ha-a-a-a-a-a-a! I've done it myself; I know exactly what I'm talking about, because I've got a good subjective reality on that sort of thing. "Hey! I just had a cognition. There's a this and a that and a tho and a thee, and down there in that engram there's a spot and a bolp and a bo—oh, my God!" Bow! The roof falls in. You got the idea? Suddenly throw into restimulation fifteen or twenty chains of something, see, just with a nice cognition. There is something earlier! Zoom! See?

Now, the auditor in that particular case wouldn't even have time to open their mouth, you know? PC is sitting there in a brown study. You think he's looking over the next RI, you know? PC all of a sudden says, "I think this came . . . I think this came from . . . Yeah, there's a . . . there's a GPM there about eighteen trillion years ago. Oh yeah. Oh yes. There it is. And it's there and there, and that fits into the other two and it comes up to here. And then that is what gives you the background music of all that—uh-uh-uh. What's the matter with my throat?" The auditor actually doesn't have time to say a word.

Now, how does that situation take place? That situation takes place when the case is already overrestimulated—greasy on the track, attention hard to control. Greasy on the track. Now, if this PC is quite a bearcat, he will go right on getting tone arm action but very uncomfortably. He'll go right on getting the tone arm action necessary to resolve the case, that's for sure. But he's running in an atmosphere of exhaustion, of worry; misemotion comes up here or there. In other words, he's a bit overwhumped all the time. You see, you've gotten up to the point of overrestimulation, and with this overrestimulation now in progress, you are still discharging things. Do you see? Case still runs but the case isn't comfortable while running. Case will still make it, but doesn't feel like he's getting many auditing wins, see? Awful hard grind. Spends most of the time between sessions in a fog, don't you see? Case still making it and tone arm running

Now, let's add this other liability. Now, you see that we've gone over some difficulties here. Now let's really clobber it. Let's say that this case we're doing this with has a fragile tone arm to begin with, which is susceptible to being stuck low or stuck high or stuck dead thetan. Let's add that liability to all this other complexity.

Now what do you think is going to happen? Well, the auditor is going to spend all of his sessions worrying about the PC, and the PC may or may not spend any sessions worrying about auditing, or between sessions, but just going around being blaaah, or having a bad time or being very nattery or something.

But the auditor is wild. Auditor is trying to get tone arm action, trying to get tone arm action. And he keeps looking. He comes back into the session. He finally got tone arm action in the last session. Oh boy, finally got it. He got four blowdowns of one division in the whole session. Oh, that's fine. That's more than he'd seen for a long time, and so forth. And he comes back in; he got this PC halfway through a GPM, don't you see? Now all he's got to do now in the next session is pick it up and finish it and that means—you know, was getting tone arm action, more tone arm action, and you run some GPMs, you know, and you get tone arm action. That's obvious, you know, wonderful. That's obvious, and so forth.

And he comes back in, and there's the tone arm. "What the hell? Well," he says, "something must have keyed in between sessions. Something must have keyed in. This tone arm is sitting

here at about six and a half. Something must have keyed in between sessions. All right. All right. Something keyed in between sessions. All right.

“Since the last time I audited you . . . Now! when was that? When was the last time I audited you? Last time, last time now? When—when was that?”

PC finally thinks and thinks and thinks and thinks, and finally remembers. No tone arm action.

“Now, since the last time I audited you, has anything been suppressed?” There it sits. Right on down through all of those buttons, there it sits. PC tells you all sorts of things, but there it sits. You say, “That’s obvious enough to give anybody tone arm action,” but there it sits! Horrible!

You say, “Well, if I can just finish off the rest of this GPM . . . Now, in this session, if I can just finish off the rest of the GPM . . .” You say, “All right, now let’s pick it up at the last item where we left it,” and so forth.

And the PC says, “Last item? What . . . what’s the last item?”

“Well, that last item. It was ‘absolutely coughing,’ you know,” and so on. “Let’s pick it up.”

And the PC says that and then the needle doesn’t twitch and nothing happens and nothing moves, and . . . You realize suddenly that if you stay there any longer, this PC is liable to do an around-the-clock and go into maybe a low. tone-arm case, or something like that. You realize that you’re looking at something here which can’t hold, because you’re getting absolutely no discharge at all. And you hit the silk, and you get out of that. And you say you’re going to put in the itsa line on auditing or you’re going to do a Prepcheck on auditing or you’re going to take anything that you’ve had as a good way, you know, to key off the case, and so forth.

Now, in this particular case we’re talking about, this tone arm here, let us say, has gone at 5.75. So you say, “All right, we’ll just destimulate the auditing. That’s easy. Just destimulate the auditing and we’ll get tone arm action back, obviously.” So we say, “All right. Now, on auditing, when was—well, how many years have you been audited?” or something like that, or “How many months? Has anything been suppressed?” And of course you get the same story as the since mid ruds. There it sits at 5.75—no tone arm action. The restimulation is now too great to permit even the discharge of the key-in. That’s what you’ve run into. In other words, you’re running this case downhill on a toboggan. And it all traces back to what?

Now, you see, this is quite a problem I’ve outlined to you here. And I see from the looks on some of your faces that you yourselves have had something like this problem. Now, the resolution of this problem is therefore pretty gargantuan. And that’s what—just to get it all in line that’s what’s been resolved with service facsimile.

Service facsimile, in actual fact, is not an accusative thing. It is simply a solution that the individual has himself so restimulated that it won’t discharge and nothing will discharge past it. In other words, it’s a solution that is so valuable, so survival, so magnificent, that if one got rid of it as a solution, one would, of course, perish at once like a wax effigy, you see, would just melt right there, you see, and be gone. Too horrible to contemplate getting rid of this solution. Actually, it is simply an overcharged solution. That is all it is.

Now, how does it get so overcharged? Well, it’s because the PC is restimulating it. It isn’t being restimulated by life. There’s volition going on here. The PC himself is keeping this thing kicked in.

This girl has life solved, has life solved: Don’t eat. Every time the boss is mean to her, something like that happens, “Well,” she says, “I don’t have to eat. That’s the good, sensible solution to the whole thing. Therefore, really, I don’t really need a job; I really don’t need anything.”

The husband, he's a little bit mean, nattery and upset some evening. So she says she knows what to do about this: He don't eat. Dinner accidentally burns or something like this, see? And one of the children gets upset, something like that. Well, she knows what to do about that: Kid just won't eat, that's all. That's it. He's had it, see? And all of this is so complicated and so filled with ramifications that it actually has become a survival computation. And it sits there. It sits there like a mountain rising out of the plain or a dam across a river, and no charge can flow by it. Because if charge were permitted to flow by it . . .

You see, the difference between our rationale, and so forth, is we know people do things See, it's not on the automatic, push-button type mentality of Pavlov, you see, and Wundt and the rest of these birds—gents—jerks—fellows. Push-button mentality, you see, that it's always caused by some mechanical thing. No, there's also a being there. He's also up to something, and that's the further complication, don't you see? The person can do something, you see?

Now, if you tell somebody that the survival computation is “not to eat”—if you told somebody else—they'd say, “You're nuts!” But not—not this one. See, that is the survival computation. Well, naturally, it's aberrated, but unfortunately for this being, it works: Hubby always gets in line; the kids always shut up. Don't you see? And she can relax enough about her job or doing what she's doing, so that by saying “Well, I don't have to eat,” you see, that actually that sort of—she stops attacking in that zone and sphere. And it actually has some weird, backwards, upside-down survival computation, see?

So what it is, is a nonsurvival solution which has become survival. And it doesn't make sense—not even to the person, when they begin to take it apart. It really doesn't make sense, but it appears to make sense. It appears to make sense. And that solution can become so fixed in the activities of the individual that the individual feels that if it were disturbed in any way, life would become unlivable. And this can be a pretty batty solution.

You maybe are looking at a service facsimile when you look at a suicide type of thing: The way to live is to dive off the top of the Empire State Building, see? Now, you say, “That's nutty.” But the funny part of it is when you run it, if it weren't so pathetic, you would probably be able to sit there and just almost ruin your stitches, because this—it's wild! I mean, how this thing works out. I mean, the way the put-together, the A=A=A and the disassociate, and so forth, of this is so—so fantastic.

And very often in the early stages of it, the PC will sit there and they give it to you with such a straight face and with such a solution to the whole thing and, “Well, yes, obviously. Obviously, the way to cure a fear of height is to fall off the Empire State Building,” or something like this, you see? It'd be something fantastic. Even that's too sensible.

But what it is, is a solution which has become fixed and which the individual is actually working with. And maybe they've been overwhelmed by this solution—it's explainable in bank terms, too—but the individual keeps that chain or channel in restimulation, And then you start to audit the engrams of this thing, and all the individual sells you is bring up more engrams of this thing, but oddly enough they won't erase.

And this was another source of search. The other source of search, of course, was why do some engrams erase and some engrams not erase. That is an old, idle datum—been kicking around for a long time. Some engrams grind out and some discharge. Why? Some PCs turn on mass when you prepcheck them and some don't—mostly don't—but some do.

What's with this PC who does? What's with this PC who can't erase this particular engram? You go over on the left and right of this engram channel and you can find engrams that will erase, but the PC never gives you those; they only give you the engram channel. That's because they're obsessively restimulating this particular channel in the bank. They're obsessively restimulating it, because it's survival to have that. Therefore, they will sell you as

the auditor that particular channel if it is a service facsimile, because their penchant is to keep it restimulated. So they always sell you that channel.

And then you, you knuckle head, you going to run it out, man. Why, you've picked—if that person is a service-facsimile case, which—not all cases run this way, fortunately. Unfortunately for us, many cases run quite easily and smoothly without any of these complications, don't you see? In fact a little more than half of your cases will run smoothly, without these computations.

Well, that makes it bad, don't you see, because then you're unable to understand this other percentage of cases that doesn't run smoothly, see? So you say these techniques work, but on some cases they don't work. Well, therefore, you have to bring the broad line of restimulation and so forth. Aberration is always of some use. At some time or another anybody's aberration on any subject has been of some use to them—always. You can trace it always—you can trace it back. It's been of some use. Otherwise they wouldn't keep mocking it up. But it normally doesn't amount to this fixed service-facsimile-level crash, you see? And it erases, and it handles up, and the guy cognites on it, and it straightens up, and all that sort of thing happens.

But on a service facsimile none of these things occur. The engrams don't erase, the Prepchecks don't work, the tools of the game are suddenly null and void, apparently, unless you know this little, secret channel down through the middle of it. And that secret channel is advised by any tone arm trouble.... That doesn't mean that for a quarter of a session . . . Since you always get the top of a GPM almost always early on in a case, you're going to find the tone arm hung up high or something like that. The tone arm normally will hang up on the first fifteen, twenty items of a GPM and then suddenly loosen up and tone arm action restores. That's on a Helatrobust type GPM. In the fast stages of hitting a GPM, you normally will get a bit of a lockup. That's beside the point. That's just a point in the session where the thing locks up. No, we're talking about the case that gives you trouble with a tone arm, the case that is a dead thetan, a low-tone-arm case, a high-tone-arm case or a case whose tone arm hangs up at the drop of a hat.

The full, complete diagnosis of the case is done with the tone arm, not with how loopy they're acting in life. I think anybody on this planet is acting loopy in life, see? If you put it up against survival standards, you'd find it was very nonsurvival. You cannot be human and be right. So there's no reason at all to try to trace it back, analytically, or medically, psychiatrically—say he's got schitzobonga, or something, you see? There's no sense in any of this. This is all for the birds. There isn't any reason to do it off of a graph. There isn't any reason to do it off of any of your tests. Nothing. The only place you'll really see this is by putting the PC on an E-Meter, and then, if the PC's tone arm looks all tight, running the PC a while to see if you run into the trouble.

You see, you could even be fooled—and some of you will be by a dead thetan case that merely has a Clear read and a tight needle. Maybe the person isn't a dead-thetan case; maybe they're just sitting in the middle of a bump of some kind or another that's got the needle slightly tight. And you ask them one question and you practically have a free needle, see? Needles change in their characteristic. This may be hard to analyze, but that's the only state that is hard to analyze. The low tone arm, the high tone arm—the second you-put them on the meter . . . The low tone arm, the dead thetan: definitely, always service-fac case. Dead thetan: service fac. Bang, bang. That's all.

This person cannot get discharge in life. In the process of living he discharges no aberration. So living is a very, very aberrative thing to him. See, he's right up against it there: there's no accidental discharge of anything. Give him a birthday present, he doesn't say "Hey, what do you know!" you know, and his tone arm moves, even though you haven't got him on the meter, see? No, nothing like that ever occurs. This guy's tone arm is fixed all the time, all the time all the time, you see? Always fixed. And as he lives, he just gets unhappier and unhappier; life becomes crueler and crueler. And eventually he becomes a newspaper reporter, you know, or something like that.

It's a very weird thing how many newspaper reporters I've seen who are dead-thetan cases. Restimulation of life is too high for their level of understanding.

Now, the low-tone-arm case: definitely service facsimile. All you have to do is put somebody on the tone arm, see it's got a low tone arm, see it's hanging down below two here: nah, service facsimile. That's it. See? Diagnosis right now, bang; you just know.

High: questionable, but probable. You can question it, but it's probable. But you just accidentally put somebody on the tone arm—you just put somebody on the meter and you find his tone arm is reading high, that's enough, see: service fac.

Now, case down here at 3.5, 3.75, something like that, with a fairly decent needle and so forth: some possibility still exists that this is a service-facsimile case. So it goes from some possibility still exists to maybe/maybe-not but probable on the high-tone-arm case.

Low-tone-arm case: yes, yes, yes, yes, yes, yes—nothing else. Dead thetan case: well, you're lucky if you can get them to talk to you long enough to give you the service facsimile. Definitely service-facsimile cases.

So any difficulty with this tone arm; any difficulty with this tone arm . . . Now, I'm talking about tone arm difficulty; I'm not talking about difficulty with a case. You know, difficulty getting a PC into things and difficulty getting them out of things. And you can have a thousand different things that could be difficult in running a case. Well, just—it's just difficult to run cases. That's not diagnosis, that's just a banality.

Oh, this guy, every time you let him anywhere near the backtrack. why, he all of a sudden starts picking up things at trillions-eight, then there's one at trillion-thirteen, and then there's one at trillions-six, and so forth. Yeah, you have trouble with this guy. You have trouble limiting his line, getting him into something and so forth. Well, the case is simply overrestimulated. You could use this same technology and possibly hope you could find a service facsimile on him to cool it down. Wonder why this stuff doesn't bleed off faster or why the case restimulates himself to this degree: Maybe it still lies in the realm and zone of a service facsimile, you see? Possibility that it does. It's worth scouting, worth scouting.

But all these troubles I'm talking about are troubles with the tone arm. Anybody who's got a troublesome tone arm, has given you a bad time, won't move enough, gets stuck in these three positions with great ease no, man, you're looking at a service-facsimile case.

Now, what you're doing is looking at the normal river of discharge blocked up with a great, big, high stable datum—"horses sleep in beds," see—with this slight trimmings: He knows that if he gets rid of this and if he no longer believed that horses slept in beds, oh, cut his throat! Finish him! The hallmark of a service facsimile is that some time during—in the running out of this service facsimile—some time during its run-out or between sessions (you'll hear about it when the PC comes back into the next session), a person questions the wisdom of getting rid of it. I don't care if it's jabbing butcher knives in their right arm. He will question the wisdom of getting rid of this aberration. And you might miss hearing it on some cases, but it is always there Sometime in the process of running it out, they got up to this level.

"Now, let's see, if I got rid of this, uhhhh . . . ohhh, I don't know. I don't know." Say his service facsimile is "hitting policemen," see? "Oh, I don't know —if I got rid of that, man, I just might be in jail all the time."

You look at him in amazement, you know? "If you got rid of the service facsimile of hitting policemen, you would be in jail all the time." You don't treat him like that as an auditor, see, but you'll hear some weird ones. The guy is in jail all the time from hitting policemen, see? But if he got rid of the service facsimile of hitting policemen, something would go very wrong in his life and he couldn't survive and it would be finished, see?



It's where life has been so overwhelming and he has done so much overwhelming that it—actually, it makes no more sense: he has abandoned it, and in lieu of any good sense he has erected this monument. See? And that monument is a monument to total asininity.

“The way to have good health is to smoke cigarettes, you see, and never take any exercise,” and so forth, and so forth. And you'll hear this guy going on along in this and you'll hear a dissertation and it seems to be just a little bit offbeat. And you'll wonder how on earth this—what this really adds up to.

Well, without precise assessment you probably could not establish exactly what it was. But it might be as banal as “good health.” The service facsimile is “good health.” How do you have good health? Well, the best way to have good health is eat poisonous foods and throw yourself under trucks wherever possible, and so forth. You see, the thing is completely twisted around the other way to. It's an aberrated survival computation, is what it is.

Now, it might better be called a service computation, or a survival computation—but we already have this term service facsimile, so we might as well stay with it for the present at least—because it isn't just one facsimile. It actually isn't a facsimile at all. It's the guy himself keeping facsimiles in restimulation because he knows what's best.

You see all this wild aberration inside of a society which compels its citizens to do this or that. You're probably looking at third-dynamic service facsimiles. They get stuck on these things. Take the jail system which is used right now in the West. The jail system is rather interesting. Because they know for a fact, and all their statistics demonstrate, every single one of them demonstrates—the lot—that they increase criminality with the present prison system. All the penologists know this and they adhere to it slavishly.

In 1835 a study was conducted to find out what penal systems were in use around the world—not to find out which was most workable, but what ones were in use, And they adopted the present system in Philadelphia. They adopted this present system of the cell and the confinement and the guard and the this and that. And at the time they adopted it, they knew that it did the least rehabilitation.

I mean, the committee that did this had the data in front of them that they were doing the most they possibly could to perpetuate crime by adapting the present prison system. Now, this prison system today is so general and it is in use so far and wide, and the present court system—court system is not any part of it—is so wide and general and so forth, that everybody thinks that is the only prison system there could be. That is very far from a fact. There are actually hundreds of prison systems. And yet they have hung themselves with the one which they found was the least rehabilitative, the least workable and produced the most crime. And that was done by study—by careful, analytical study. So you must realize that there are third-dynamic service facsimiles at work. It's a totally nonsurvival computation to choose the worst prison system you could possibly choose, and yet they set out to do so.

So I don't think they were studying public safety. See, they weren't any longer studying public safety. They were simply studying how to make criminals wrong!

So penology, by 1835, had ceased to be a study of how to make an honest society safe from the inroads of a criminal and had begun to be just a system by which to dramatize “the criminal is wrong,” see, so no longer had any useful application. I don't care what money they're spending on crime today: If they'd stop spending it, they'd have less crime. I don't care how weird and aberrated that happens to look. But I'm just showing you, here is a solution stuck in the society.

Not to go on this subject, because it's not a horse I ride; it just happens to be an interesting datum. I got this out originally and was rather interested that Warner Brothers did one on this a long time ago. Crime colleges: that's what they've established. You want to—as I asked you in

an earlier lecture, how is it that argot is the one thing that seems to be a current slingo that goes along, a language that carries along, and yet it's the most secret language there is. How is this perpetuated? Well, it's perpetuated by the state with its existing prison system. So with that argot, then, must go all the systems of defrauding, robbing, murdering and wrecking the society. And they have gratuitously, at public expense, erected these universities all over the place in which these fellows can carefully communicate to one another the very best criminal methods. And this is all done at great public expense.

And that's a service facsimile at work. That solution—the prison, see— stands up there right now as the primary method why the society is going criminal. And yet it is supposed to be the reason why the society is never criminal. See, it's erected to protect the public from the criminal. And there it is, however, educating criminals, perpetuating crime, going forward in a very businesslike way at great public expense to do the least possible rehabilitation for the criminal, make him feel the most outlaw of any other system, make him feel the most individuated from the society, spoil his reach and therefore his sanity. It makes sense to a Scientologist particularly: put a guy in this place so he can't reach anything, can't it's anything, he's naturally—get a case deterioration. Well, if he's already a criminal because he's crazy, how about deteriorating his case? Well, naturally he'll become more of a criminal, won't he? So, all kinds of actions of this character—I'm not even standing up for another system. Frankly, if you just erected a big stockade someplace or another and told the fellows to go in there for a while, and we didn't care who they took with us, we'd probably, you know, have a better system.

If the Scientologist were to go about this—I already figured this out for the federal prisons of the United States. The head of all federal prisons in the United States has required Dianetics to be read, by the way, by all his wardens. And I worked out a system for him. Too much work for me to put into effect and so never went into effect. We are not without friends or connections or influence, in spite of the fact that some two-bit—some drug addicts, the Federal Drug Addicts, are after us, because they're actually not under the government, they're under the AMA.

Well, that's who pays them, you know? People work for those who pay them, don't they, normally? Naturally. They, by the way, recently got some legislation through, I see. Now, so that anything is mislabeled, all they have to do is arrest the guy and throw him in prison without a hearing. I was interested in this new legislation that came through from the FDA. When they do something like this, they get a level of unpopularity that has exclamation points after it. So they're doing their best, and we'll help them out. The direction which they want to go, we will help them go, any day now.

But there is service facsimile.

Government sets itself up a stable datum: "Foods must not have noxious products in them." And this outfit is now protecting the public against good electrical equipment and certifying electric-shock machines that break people's teeth and spines. And they pass these. But the E-Meter: no, that's deadly. It's pretty grim—I mean, it's pretty gruesome when you start to think over the level of action.

Well now, that again, on a third-dynamic level, is a service facsimile in action. See, somebody put up this solution that the public shouldn't have to eat noxious food products OF something like this, or poison should be kept out of foods. That, basically, you see, is a good idea. And then this idea starts going all mad, and madder and madder and madder, till practically the only thing that'll get certified is something that kills somebody. See? You get the idea?

Well, all right, so they must be there simply to make somebody wrong. I don't think they have anything to do with anything except making somebody wrong. I don't know who they're trying to make wrong. They're not going to make us wrong. But they must have somebody they want to make wrong, and we're not quite sure who it is. But there is, you might say, a service facsimile.

Well now, you take any good solution to a situation and then plow that solution in so that it lower-harmonics. It goes through several flips. Stays itself, you see, but it's lower and lower and lower on the tone scale. It finally gets below all other solutions and becomes itself an aberration.

Now, it isn't true that all solutions become service facsimiles. You could immediately conclude this. As a matter of fact, I have looked at it rather wildly occasionally and said, "My heavens, if you—if any time you solve something, why, you're in the soup." No, no, that isn't it.

A service facsimile is a solution which is insisted upon but won't itsa. It's a solution which is insisted upon but won't itsa. A solution, to be a solution, leads to a further ability to itsa.

Now, if you solve something on the basis of the solution reduces the itsa or the ability to itsa, then you've set up a-potential service facsimile. This is one of the reasons why Scientology would never become a service facsimile in a society. See, it increases the ability to itsa.

Now, let's look back at the F1)A for a moment. They are taking over a role of classifying for and protecting the public from making up their own minds about food. They're denying the public an analytical attitude toward products. And they step in there and protect the public from themselves, which is to say, they cut the public itsa. Now having reduced the public itsa very severely along a level where it didn't need reduction, they have then set up a situation where anybody they pass is okay. The public then loses the criterion of inspection; the public no longer does its own inspection. They don't buy Salinas Valley lettuce because it's good and avoid Mexican lettuce because it's bad, see? But the FDA, aberratedly, because it's in some wild state, then goes in and passes—because somebody slipped them a quick buck or something like that (slipped them Mexican lettuce)—and says, "Well, that's okay. Mexican lettuce: that's—that's all right, that's all right. Seal of approval—bang. It's fertilized with dysentery."

Look what happens to the public suddenly. The public can be caved in by it, because it's opened a gate which is destructive. See what they are? They are not, then, increasing familiarity with the environment. They are decreasing it and leaving this area in a mystery. And it's all set up on the irrational supposition that they're infallible.:

They had some non-pregnancy drug the other day and it had wild side effects, and they passed it. They passed it. There's been several drugs of recent times that have been passed that are terribly destructive one way or the other. Now, obviously, some role exists for such an agency. But every time you set up such an agency, you set up a potential service facsimile, which will then accumulate to it a great deal of evil. And the next thing you know, you have set up a situation where nobody can live with it. Now, you get how that's done? It's by reducing itsa.

For instance, you'd almost never look for travel agencies to aberrate a society. See, you wouldn't look to a travel agency as a primary source of aberration in the society. They could bring in a little bit. We had a situation here in England where anybody that could buy a ticket in the West Indies, you see, could come to London. And some shipping company made millions shipping everybody to London. And this was looked on in some particular lines as something. And then oddly and wildly enough, the Parliament up here was faced with the embarrassing situation, suddenly, of limiting the amount of immigration from one of its own colonies—very embarrassing. They managed to get over it and pass it and nobody has ever heard of it since. And they've limited immigration in that particular line. But I'm afraid this wasn't even much of an aberration. I mean, that's about as close as a travel agency could come, you see?

So it doesn't mean that all these sources are perfect. Little randomities exist around these other sources, don't you see? But broadly, those that directly reduce the itsa—those that directly reduce the itsa and don't help or support the itsa line in any way—are most likely to become service facsimiles. They're a solution without inspection which is too broadly applied.

This girl has a survival solution: She simply says, "Families are no good." This is what she's made up her mind to. She holds that in place. She proves it to herself all the time. She works day and night. She sits there—you can see her in a brown study, you know? She's sitting there and so on. "Hmm, yesh. Yeah," she'll say to herself, "yeah. Proves it. Mother didn't say anything to me this afternoon, so that of course proves, you see, families are no good." See, and it all works out. Now, she doesn't have to look to find out why didn't Mother speak to her all afternoon. And that brings about a no as-ness of mass. There's no necessity to inspect. She's got it solved. Mother didn't speak to her all afternoon because families are no good. That's it. She didn't have to inspect the fact that she, last evening when she took the car out, bent the front fender and then didn't say anything about it and didn't offer to do anything about it and put it back in the garage. And Mama found it at noon and cut the communication line because she already knows that it's disastrous to try to talk, you see?

So you've got a situation there. Now, that little ARC break is never going to blow away, is it? It's never going to be talked about, not going to be any communication on the subject and so forth. Well, what's preventing it from being talked about? "Families are no good." That proves it.

You understand, it gets charged up because every one of these ARC breaks that contributes to it in its immediate vicinity charges it up further, and the person holds it in line harder, and more ARC breaks pile up on it until it eventually becomes an accumulation of mass. And therefore, when you prepcheck somebody with a service facsimile around the vicinity of this service facsimile without hitting it on, you turn on mass. The source of the mass is nothing has been itsa'd.

Now, you're prepchecking them this way: "Since the last session, has anything been suppressed?" Let's say it's auditing that's the target. This is in vignette; this is not a real service facsimile—"My auditor is no good."

("There is no reason to answer this question because my auditor is no good, because auditors are no good.") "No." Now the case is in a solid, continuous ARC break so it doesn't register on your meter.

"Since the last session, has anything been invalidated?" you see?

"Nope." ("Auditors are no good. Wouldn't do me any good to answer the question anyway, because auditors are no good.") You see?

Yet the case isn't thinking this consciously. Case isn't thinking that consciously. That's just everything that you ask the case comes up against this.

And you—my God—you're trying to talk to this case. You're trying to get this case to talk. You're trying to get this case to do something. And you do know what you're doing. And yet you're going up against some kind of a barrier like this in this case. And then all of a sudden, you wheel back and you say, "Uhh-uhh! I'm a failure as an auditor."

No, you're not a failure as an auditor. You just didn't clip the service facsimile that made auditing impossible. You see that? And this is expressed by the no-motion of the tone arm action. Because there is no itsa in that immediate vicinity, there's no, then, dismissal or discharge of the charge hanging up on it. You see that?

Now, you're listening to this opinion, "Auditors are no good," on somebody who never inspects an auditor or auditing. There's no itsa. In other words, the whole thing is just completely unjustified. How do they know whether the auditor is no good or not? They've seldom heard one; they've never looked at them. See, how would they know?

And let's get another situation: I'm very, very sure that some of you have been over the coals of being considered immature, or some other way, by either your mother or father or family—irresponsible, see? Now, you probably have never asked yourself this other question: "Did they ever look at me?" Now, there's lots of mothers, the last time they looked at little Roscoe was when he was about two. And they're still trying to advise two-year-old Roscoe at the age of thirty what he should do about his marriage. Well, they don't know anything about him.

If you want to give somebody a send that has a lot of family trouble, just ask them questions along that particular line, and so on. Ask them what they have observed about their family. There's a good RIC. Probably get tone arm action out of that, you see, because it's on the fringe of something if they're having trouble with something. And they're liable to come up with the realization that their family has never looked at them and doesn't know them. See, we itsa the situation, some preconceived notion.

Societies tend to get stuck with these things, to get stuck with some idea. And it's very interesting that this is probably the way that a society reduces its strength, just as an individual reduces his strength this way. I feel sorry for this society, in a number of ways, because in certain zones and areas which the society depends upon for its control of mean, vicious, nasty persons (and things like us), these guys haven't got any itsa line out. Do you realize what's happening? If you want to look at it bluntly, these guys are sitting back taking the wrong actions with regard to certain situations. They're trying to prevent—through their wrong itsa on Scientology—they're trying to prevent certain zones and spheres of activity, which is to say, "the public must not be practiced on by an unqualified guy who doesn't happen to pay dues to us," and that sort of thing.

All right, now they're set with certain set, fixed ideas, see? They believe these ideas. And they believe that what we're doing and what we have to do with is no good and it's corn, see, and that it's not any advance on anything.

And my God, during this whole period of time we're moving right straight on ahead into more mental technology and more technology about life and livingness than they ever dreamed could ever exist. We have actually been effectually isolated and insulated from any further interference, or from having our energies drained down by being made to comply with or agree with the mores of their particular practice lines. That would have slowed us down like mad, don't you see? We're moving forward at express-train velocity.

There isn't any faculty of any college or something like that is going to tell you or me whether or not we had better research or not research some particular sphere of existence. If we can put an itsa line on it, we look at it. It doesn't then make it "bad" or "impolite," see, or something like that—"this is why we shouldn't look." And we're actually traveling as a subject without a service fac, and it's making fantastic velocity. And here these poor sods are, whose whole life is bound up in these—you know, the mustard-plaster level of healing. And they're not in contest to keep their developmental line coming forward, so there they sit, and there we go.

How high can it rise before the potential suddenly explodes? They're nuts. That's what it makes them look to us. The potential will eventually explode in their faces. In what way? They suddenly won't have any patients. Nobody will be paying any attention to them, because they have a wholly authoritarian educational system. That is to say, they put it on TV, "You must see your local doctor. Your local doctor receives you in open arms." Well, they're so unreal they don't realize that that isn't the public line. Their word of mouth—I don't care how much advertising you buy, you got to have good word of mouth, man. You can buy newspapers full of advertising to get somebody to go see a movie that's no good and the theater will stay empty, because their word of mouth is bad, you see? And the word of mouth on medicine is very bad. Very bad.

And while they're taking fortunes away from people in the United States for not healing them, and not advancing their own technical lines, and not really measuring up the way they should, they're not making the effort necessary to survive. Why? Because they have a service facsimile

on us. They don't even know they've got it. It's hidden down amongst their case, amongst any other batty lines.

I had a good news story on the subject. I didn't release it. It might have woke them up. They have to reorganize the whole of mental and physical healing before they could cope with what we're doing. This potential—these poles are stretching further and further and wider and wider apart, and eventually they will become a no-factor. That's what happens to them: they're a no-factor. They simply are not powerful enough or influential enough or anything else enough to do anything about it.

You may not think that we're growing. But I look back over any six months of the last ten and eleven years, and frankly, I hardly recognize a comparable size—just six months to the next six months. This is a rather fantastic thing, only this is going on internationally.

Now, did you ever double a penny for thirty-two days? It's the old mathematical trick. A guy says, "Well, you needn't pay me anything but one cent doubled every day for thirty-two days."

And somebody says, "That's fine," but of course at the end of thirty-two days—I don't know what the figure is. It's either a million pounds, or it's something like that that it has grown up to, don't you see? It only takes this type of curve growth going on up.

Now, therefore, they're not impeding what they should be impeding if they wanted to survive, themselves. They're not handling the situation within its own zone of reality. And that's all aberration is, is a failure to handle the situation in its own zone of reality.

So this, then, is the service that a service facsimile performs. It makes it unnecessary for an individual to handle the situation in its own sphere of reality—makes it unnecessary to do so. So nobody ever does anything about it; so mass accumulates up on it. Now, any mass that accumulates on a case, any mass that accumulates by reason of Prepcheck, any body mass that occurs by reason of processing and so forth, must to some degree or another then be batting up against a service facsimile. And if a person cannot be knocked out on the subject of a psychosomatic illness of some character or another by processing, then that must be part of a service facsimile.

Those things that auditing won't change are, then, rooted in this other mechanism. They're a solution without inspection which pulls in upon it all the uninspected mass. That's all. And of course, mass disappears because it's as-ised. And when a person does not as-is the mass that is there, be naturally gets an accumulation of mass. And the mass that accumulates around one of these service facsimiles is rather marvelous to behold. And of course, it's that mass accumulating which holds and prevents the Prepcheck action. And those are the technical mechanisms which prevent tone arm action.

If you don't get tone arm action, it's because the individual does not as-is and has not as-ised any mass in that zone or area for a long time. And not having as-ised any, when you get into its vicinity, you go into it with a thud if it gets anywhere close to processing, getting well or handling the environment in which the individual finds himself.

The auditing session, to this effectiveness, extends out to everything the individual does during the period of time that he's being audited and every environment he finds himself in. So that if any service facsimile exists which is being reacted upon in any of his environment, anyplace, it will to some degree influence his auditing. And the more of these things exist, the harder it is for you to get tone arm action—until it gets impossible.

Now, an individual can have a service facsimile and still get tone arm action—get some tone arm action. And it would be better in some cases to make sure that the service facsimiles are out of the way before plunging backtrack. The amount of time that you could save in processing is a very large factor. I've just made a restudy of this. And I've been brushing off Clear left and right and saying no good, no good—you know, I mean, and so on, Keyed-out Clear. And I

recently found out that you can stabilize—there's a possibility here of stabilizing a Clear by the eradication of the things that will key in. So, you see, if you knock out a number of service facsimiles out of an individual, why, the case then stays stable to the degree that it doesn't still have service facsimiles.

Now, R3SC is an extremely workable process. I have written it up; it's been released. Of course, one can expect certain refinements of a process of this particular character. But this is peculiarly complete, because we accidentally already had a couple of types of assessment that you could do for this. We have the old 2-12 assessment, and we have the R3R assessment—preliminary step. They're perfectly adequate, don't you see? There are slippier assessments that you can do and I'm sure we'll have some fancier assessments on it one way or the other, but these happen to be adequate assessments. And you'll find that the mere inspection of a folder from beginning to end will give you a bunch of candidates. Just inspect the folder. Just start turning over things and looking at auditors' notes and mentions of this and that, and what the individual has had bang-bang runs on of one character or another—whether they gave tone arm action or not, you see? But look particularly for periods of no tone arm action and then go back before those periods and find out what was being addressed on the case. And you'll probably have a service facsimile combo sitting right there, and just use it in your ordinary steps of R3SC.

You get an idea: let's take a period—we found a period here the individual was audited for an intensive and toward the last half of the intensive got no tone arm action. We notice this from the old, old, old, old auditor's reports, see? We find out that on Wednesday "form" was addressed by the auditor and that was the end of tone arm action. We notice that there may have been two subjects there that could have been addressed. Well, run them both! Don't be chicken see?

Now, you can run almost anything with R3SC, which is what makes it very good. Just don't overrun it. And if the PC says nor and he can't give it answers and so forth, come off of it; don't shove it down his throat. With those ramifications, then, it doesn't much matter what you pick to be the service facsimile. But if you do a slippy assessment, which is a preliminary-step assessment, it's a bingo assessment right dead on—and something like that—boy, you get action, man, you'll get action. But if you pick almost anything else, you will also get some action.

So it's not critical—the assessment is not terribly critical. Of course, the faster you get what is really the service facsimile on the case, then the faster your tone arm action restores and the case reverts to battery. So there's a lot of ramifications to this sort of thing. But in the final analysis is, here is a process, full-bloom, which totally replaces your R2-12 type processes—makes them utterly unnecessary—and takes care of this thing we call a rock slammer, and takes care of body mass and a lot of other things in cases that we've been particularly worried about, and particularly takes care of the auditor's main worry which is "How do I get tone arm action on this PC?" Obviously, if he can't get tone arm action on the PC, the PC is sitting in a service facsimile. I mean, that's the end product of that.

Now, you may have to run two or three or four service facsimiles, but by that time you're going to Clear. So you might as well go ahead and clear the guy: Throw it all out of restimulation; make the case sit there with a free-flop needle, and so forth, and say, "All right, I cleared you." Let the guy enjoy it. Let him enjoy it for a day or an afternoon or something like that before you reach for the earlier GPM.

All right. Now, that's R3SC. And I hoped . . . I noticed—do you notice that it's tabulated 3? I want to make a short note on that. It's the tabulation of 3 is because, actually, it is a 3 process—being a clearing process. We rehabilitate Scientology levels against the existing scale, and that means that your R3N, and so forth, will be called R4N. It's a reorientation. But I'm not going to reuse their letters when they're moved up to 4. And there aren't any other R4s, so they're very easy to recognize, and they won't get you tangled up in any way.

And then we'll be able to throw these clearing techniques straight where they belong and there are a few of them there, so we want them tabulated. We're getting our house in order, and it's making very good sense the way it's going together.

That means that there's quite a few cases around here will have to be cleared before they go on to OT. I'm sorry, but that's the way it is.

Thank you.