

ETHICS AND CASE SUPERVISION

A lecture given on
9 October 1968

Well this is what number lecture? (Thirteen) Ah ha. And the date? Nine Oct. AD 18. I would like to put a warning on the tape, he said in a sepulchral voice. That's a great word, sepulchral. You ever hear that word? It means from a sepulchre, a tomb. On this cheerful note we begin this lecture.

That, if you have something in affluence you apply the affluence formula. If you have something in power you apply the power formula. If you have something in emergency you apply the emergency formula. And if you don't do this you fall on your heads. It just happens to be in the general nature of things that you fall on your silly 'ead.

Now I have seen a division go into affluence, be assigned affluence, and then slack off and change everything. And it's fall is so free fall that it is practically a rocket assist. It goes down the conditions with a velocity the like of which you never saw. It is the most fantastic phenomena you've ever cared to see in your life.

There are two things you can do with regard to formulas and conditions. Two things. One is to assign the wrong condition. "Well he's been good to us, so we're gonna assign Pete power." And Pete, hell he couldn't make emergency if he had one of these fireman's step ladders.

So we assign Pete power. Now the law there, and it's an operating law, is that he will drop one condition below the condition he is actually in. Let us say he is really in nonexistence. But some manager, some secretary, some executive secretary, wants to be a good fellow. Or gets into propitiation, or something, see? So they give Oscarvitch a condition of affluence, 'cause they want to increase his pay or something, you know? They don't really know what the hell he's doing. He's been sort of wandering around, stumbling on his head. He's really in non-existence. He doesn't even come to work. But he's an awfully good fellow. An awfully good fellow. Holds his liquor. Free and easy with his girlfriends. Something, something. He's really in non-existence.

All you have to do is to assign him a wrong upper condition, and he promptly drops one below where he actually is. He's in nonexistence, really. We assign him affluence. He goes into liability. He now is operating in liability. In actual fact you will now find out he is operating in liability. Very remarkable.

Let us take the affluence formula on just one point, and apply it to a nation. One point. Economize. The funny thing about affluence is, is if you don't economize you've had it. You get in a sudden influx of this, that and the other thing it's usually a lot of, and the tendency is, and the reason why people fall on their heads when they go into affluence is, they suddenly spend it all and interrupt the operation by which they got it in. Or by which they made it. See? And at that moment, whatever actual condition they are in will lower one condition.

So, we apply economy to a firm which at best in danger condition. Firm is really in danger condition, so we start economizing. That's part of the affluence formula. The firm will at once go into non-existence.

Let us say a government is in danger condition. It's in danger condition because the head of the government has to bypass all of his ministers. To get anything done he has to bypass all of his ministers, or is bypassing all of his ministers. He isn't really applying the danger formula, but he's certainly bypassing in all directions, frantically trying to get something done. And so he enjoins economy. He says he's not going to change any of his ministries. He says he's going to stand by his friends, that he's bypassing like mad. He says, "Our program must go on to victory." While it's already falling on its' stupid head. You can expect that government not only

to go into non-existence, but that country to pass into other hands. Not other political hands, but other racial hands. It works. It is true.

Now the reverse occurs. The reverse occurs. But it's just under the same formula. A guy is actually in emergency, and you put him in liability. And he'll go into danger condition. If the formulas of the wrong condition are then enforced he might even drop one or two more down below where he is. And he might actually arrive in liability. Do you follow? Because the longer the wrong condition is perpetuated the more it drops. It certainly drops one. But now, if we don't let the condition upgrade, if we don't do something about it, if the condition is now perpetuated, and so on, he will drop another condition. And another condition. And another condition. So the assignment of wrong conditions brings about a lowering of condition.

There is no way you can assign a wrong condition and get an improvement of conditions. So therefore you have to know something about the assignment of conditions.

Now even my messenger, no proper assignment of conditions. A little bit earlier I had to go out and show a messenger how to turn on a very complicated switch board that she actually should have been checked out on some time ago. And I went around, I told her to do it, she couldn't do it, I went out and did it. She'd already been a little bit slow and draggy for the last hour or so. And I said, "What condition should you assign yourself?" And she thought it over very carefully, and she said quite accurately, "Danger condition." I had had to bypass her to do the job.

Now if my messengers know this, and they are very young indeed this life; of course the one thing they do find out about in the Sea Org is conditions. They find that out very accurately. But actually they often err in the direction of a more severe condition than it warrants, and you'll actually pull it down one from the condition it is in. So anyway, if my messengers know it, why you educated cats had certainly better grab the brass rang.

If you're assigned a wrong condition you are grossly, flagrantly, illegally in error. You will have accepted an illegal order. And you could be comm-eved for it.

I'll show you how bad it is. Somebody assigns you a condition of liability. You accept the condition of liability. You become a liability, if you're not in liability. Somebody assigns you a condition of liability, you do not at once ask for an ethics hearing, you at that moment could be comm-eved for accepting an illegal order. Let us say you were only in emergency and somebody assigns you liability, and you do not now ask for an ethics hearing for correction of condition, and prepare your brief and show exactly what you're doing, exactly where you really are, you now are a liability because you have assisted in the destruction of the ethics system. And you could be comm-eved for it, because it's an illegal order.

You go around tamely accepting conditions which are incorrectly assigned without then asking for an ethics hearing to correct the condition, you then could be comm-eved.

Yeah, but how about the fellow who assigned the condition? Naturally it's his fault. He's cause. His fault. His fault. His fault. No. I'm afraid not. Maybe it seemed that that's the way it was. He wasn't in possession of all the facts. He's trying to get the job done, something of that sort. Yes, he could be called into it. But once you start comm-eving people for assigning conditions the whole justice system blows up.

The responsibility is on the receiver of the condition. Now if you don't get that enforced in orgs, and if you don't get that enforced amongst auditors, I'll give you an idea. You're C/S. You're top dog on the totem pole in your area, as a Class VIII. So somebody goofs the floop, but good. You assign him a condition of emergency. He just practically destroyed a PC. He didn't do your C/S. He's been going around, saying to the other auditors, "Nya nya nya, and all those directions I get when I, nya nya nya." And you assign him a condition of emergency and he actually is in doubt. You assign him emergency because you want to be a good fellow.

He's actually in doubt, he'll become an enemy. It's the wildest mechanism you ever saw in your life. He'll drop one. He'll drop one below the actual condition assigned.

Now, reversely, this character makes a small mistake on his administrative form as he hands it in. He displaces a couple of commas, he's assigned a condition of enemy. He doesn't at that moment ask for an ethics hearing, you comm-ev him, for accepting an illegal assignment of condition. Do you follow?

Now, you won't be the one, probably, who assigns him enemy. Somebody else assigns him enemy, he doesn't protest. You're the top dog on the totem pole, you see a misapplication of ethics, comm-ev him for accepting a wrong ethics condition. And people are liable to get the word. Do you see?

He says, "My gods Life is really tough. Already been assigned enemy, and now I'm going to be comm-ev'd for accepting the order. Let's see. Let me figure this out now. Oh, if you accept a condition, why you get comm-ev'd. I get it. Yeah." Well brother, if he's that stupid he is an enemy. (Laughter)

But what you want to do in an ethics hearing, an ethics hearing isn't just the guy appears and fluf. No, you do an ethics hearing by the book. An ethics hearing in this particular instance must be an actual assortment of what the guy actually is doing, so as to establish the actual condition that he is in.

Now you can have somebody, chaplains very often mess up the lines in an effort to cheer up things and keep people from falling off the org board, they sometimes ask for an upgrade of conditions, which should be down graded. Somebody assigns this person a condition of non-existence. And this person gets very upset. This person has just goofed the floof across the boards. He's guilty of moprey and doprey on the high seas. He actually overworked about sixteen seniors and busted up a lot of stuff in the bargain. He was only assigned non-existence. It's obviously a wrong condition. So he, "Nya nya nya nya nya." Then somebody comes along, and they say, "Look, he is nattering, so the best thing to do is assign him emergency." Now he really goofs the floof. Now he'll go around the bend. Correct assignment in this particular instance was liability.

Now supposing the fellow did all this and then lied about it. And made it impossible for anybody to find it out. Man, his effort of getting the show on the road is so dim and so thin, that he obviously is in doubt. In the first place, a person who lies to you doubts your perspicuity. Perspicuity is a smart word for awareness. He must think you're stupid. Some people are so stupid that they can lie about such a thing that is so obvious, and you have to safeguard yourself against a false auditors' report.

But let us say that the person looked like he submitted a false report. And you assigned him a liability, or something like this, and he actually had not submitted a false report. And he knows this, and he accepts the condition. He can now be comm-ev'd for having accepted a condition for a false report when none existed. Because he will now go around and natter and splatter and so forth. So as it appears on the surface, you assign the condition as it looks. If the condition is wrong, the condition should be protested to the degree of asking for an ethics hearing. If the condition is wrong, and no ethics hearing is asked for, you should comm-ev the guy. Because sometimes this mechanism occurs. You say, "This was a false auditing report. Therefore I'm assigning you liability." Or something out in an org. it would be more germane. And the guy accepts it. And he goes around in apathy. He didn't come in and tell you, "Hey, hey, hey, that's not a false report. That's a correct report." He's now doubly loused up your lines.

There are instances of fellows, under duress, and accused of murder who then, just out of savageness and protest fully admit to the whole murder. Get themselves hanged. Just to make somebody good and wrong. This mechanism exists.

Now you, in C/Sing, will have to assign some conditions. Sooner or later, if you do not assign conditions, the whirlwind will catch up with you. You can sit there like a good little fellow, and do your job jolly, jolly, jolly, and stay friends with everybody, good ARC, good ARC, good ARC. And all of a sudden find a world of hate dumped on your head. It's the most remarkable phenomenon you ever heard of. 'Cause you're just perpetually assigning the wrong condition. You think him auditor's a friend of yours who doesn't even bother to study his TRs to a point where he chops the living, screaming god out of a PC, turns you in a false auditing report, sells everybody on the idea of how you stink as a C/S because he goes around and says he followed your C/S exactly, and look what happened. You let something like that exist and every bit of good that you can do in the field will be destroyed.

It's alright to be in full ARC and little friends, little brother to all the wild. It's OK. Until it gets in your road. Until it gets in your road. You operate, not on the formula of the greatest good for me and him, you better stop operating in this narrow, restricted area, and start operating in the greatest good for the greatest number of dynamics, and then you'll win.

Do you know that you can be looked upon with contempt if you fail to get ethics in in your area when everything is going wrong? People begin to think something is wrong with you. They begin to think there's, you've got something to hide. They wonder what people have got on you.

One time there was a neglected area. I hadn't paid any attention to it at all. I knew if anything blew up in the area I had a lot of things to do, and I knew if anything blew up in this particular area I could handle it anyhow, and I wasn't paying any attention to it. I had a hundred and fifty items on the plate at the moment. And apparently somebody in that area got away with moider. And they were getting away with murder. And some other people noticed they were getting away with murder. And I wasn't paying any attention to this area at all. And all of a sudden somebody wrote me a very circuitous, covert note, "Does so and so have something on you?" They thought this individual must be under some special protection. They didn't notice that the individual was so far removed from my post as not to be noticed. But that's the sort of thing that'll develop. People begin to wonder.

They know, very often, more about the actions of people than you do. They know that Josey Ann has just got through goofing the floof. They have continued to watch Josey Ann's PCs stumble out of the auditing room and fall on their faces. And be carried off in stretchers to the local hospital. And you all of a sudden assign Josey Ann and condition of power, on the basis of a bunch of false auditing reports. And not even the examiner dared go against Josey Ann, because they figured Josey Ann had something on you. Weird, weird situations can occur.

This is an aberrated planet, and aberrated things happen. So therefore, the ethics presence of a Class VIII, and the ethics presence of a case supervisor must be beyond reproach, must be accurately carried forward, and must be established.

Now as you first establish an ethics presence, you establish it hard. After a while you can be careless about it. But you have to establish an ethics presence hard. Otherwise, you're just gonna be wrapped around a telegraph pole. You're gonna be worked to death. Cases are gonna start falling on their heads. You don't know whether you're going or coming. You say, "What's going wrong? What's going wrong. Well you must better look back to about seven or eight days ago when they carted that PC off to the local horse piddle, and you didn't assign that auditor enemy. Auditor submitted you a false report, the auditor didn't like the person vividly and took that as an opportunity to cut the person to ribbons. Things like this happen. It's an aberrated planet. And you didn't do anything about it.

Well, you're very unlucky if you also didn't find out about it. See, because whether you found out about it or not has nothing to do with whether or not you will accurately do it.

So when you're doing a C/S you mustn't talk to the auditor, you mustn't talk to the PC. You're actually at the mercy, really, of a false auditing report, and you're at the mercy of a false

examiner. If you run into this situation too hard and too bad you establish your examination line on a routing form. You establish the regular routing, the regular examination report, but in an organization they're usually routed directly through to the registrar. So you get a second registrar report. Why they're not going to sign up? So then you've got an auditors' report, an examiners' report and a registrars' report. If you're suspicious about it, why put it on the back burner just as a note over on the side of your desk. But you're gonna ask the ethics officer in a couple of weeks about this PC. Ethics record's OK right now, but in a couple of weeks we're gonna ask the ethics officer about this person. See, we're not sure. Seems alright, everybody reassures us that it's OK, but it's just something...we're a little doubtful of. Write his name on a piece of paper, "See ethics officer", and put a time machine date on it.

Now you could even, in an org which is well run, send it to time machine with a two week date on it. So it'll fall off the time machine to be sent to the ethics officer in exactly two weeks. "Please give me a report on Josey Ann Bates." Sneaky thing to do, isn't it? Josey Ann Bates, up to that moment they have no record in the org. She's done nothing bad, particularly that we can see, but it just doesn't seem alright to us, and people are reassuring us that this is alright and she's been audited in a squirrely fashion, and she came from some famous squirrel group. We're not trying to catch her, we're trying to catch out tech. So we say, "I don't...I don't...it doesn't really seem reasonable to me that all this is all OK. Because look, she's been back in review here now three times, we seem to each time fix it up but somehow or other it doesn't get fixed up, and we are applying standard tech according to the auditors' report, but for some reason or other it doesn't respond in a standard fashion.' Now the reason for that is a false auditing report.

Now you want an auditor, you want auditors in a frame of mind that before they will write a false report, they would lie awake all night shaking with terror. You don't want any false reports. That you should make very clear. Do you see? The goof might get liability, but a false auditing report, Christ knows what you're going to assign for that. Do you see? Then you can protect it. Then you can do your job.

Now I'm merely talking to you from a viewpoint of doing a job of work. Every now and then we see some crime come through the lines. Now it seems to be a very, very bad thing to take an auditing report and turn it over to ethics. But the funny part of it is, is I've caught two or three supervisors and five or six auditors, way back, which has adequately explained to me why there is a certain zone or area, why it is having a hell of a time. Now we're putting in a lot of management, let us say, in that zone or area. We try to manage that area. We're trying to manage that area. We're trying to smooth it out. We're trying to straighten it out. We're trying to handle it, and so forth. Well there's another zone and area. And that is that its' tech is out, and somebody keeps its' tech pushed out. And its' tech is very hard out. It is very out indeed.

Now, let me teach you something about tech in relationship to ethics. Although we say this, when admin goes out tech goes out. Tech goes out, ethics has gone out. The truth of the matter is, there is a tech ahead of that ethics. So it's actually, when tech goes out, ethics goes, it becomes necessary, and if it isn't put in then tech goes further out. And then admin goes out like screaming crazy. So when you find an area or an auditor where admin is thoroughly out, you know, right up the line from that, just one step back of it, that tech is out- There's something he doesn't know about tech, or there's something tech-wise mucked up on his case, or he's doing something weird with tech, or he hasn't got the word in some fashion or another. And then right ahead of that you know that he has out ethics. And then you, oddly enough, trace it back a little bit further and you will find that tech was out. See, it's actually a four point cycle, not just a three. It is very true, it is very true that when admin is out tech is out, when tech is out ethics is out. Do you understand? But it backs up one more. Tech had to be out in the first place.

So where tech goes badly out, here's another maxim here, and it's an important rule. When tech goes out ethics goes in heavily and hard. Now I haven't said you must put ethics in heavily and hard. Or that you should, or anything. I'm just telling you. It's a phenomenon. This is a phenomenon. Like, when the sun comes up you can see the mountains. See? There's

no more significance to it than that. When tech goes out ethics goes in hard. So any area where you find ethics going in hard, you know tech has already gone out. And then, if ethics doesn't go in hard, why tech won't come in. So it goes out further, and with tech out then admin goes all to hell. It's just nothing but false reports and chicken scraps on old rolls of paper.

You can go into a qual, find that their filing is bad, and all you would have to do; their filing is bad, they can't seem to find a folder; you glance at their baskets, they seem to be full and unemptied, and stuff which is coming in is in the out baskets, and so forth. All you'd have to do is glance at that, if you know your HCO training. And do you know that you could actually, at that moment, assign the Qual Sec a condition of liability without making very much error? You could assign her a condition of liability for out tech. You see? Admin's visibly out, well therefore tech is out, so you look just a little bit further than that and you'll find out that they should have gotten in ethics and they didn't. But ethics is out. They're in an out ethics situation already, not just lightly. And then, for all that to have gone to pieces, tech had to go out in the first place.

Now when you see ethics going in hard, you also know tech has been out. And do you know that people will try to solve things with only ethics? Ethics in, ethics in, ethics in, ethics in, ethics in. They're sort of stuck on the time track. See? Ethics in, ethics in, where the hell's the tech? Now unless tech followed that by going in, pointless. Stupid even. You can sort of hold the line somehow with ethics, ethics, ethics, ethics, ethics, ethics, somehow hold the line, but eventually it all starts falling to pieces. Because you haven't moved through the cycle. You've now go to get tech in. Sure, put the ethics in, put it in hard. Shoot some people, hang some bodies to the local church. We don't care what. But get in the ethics, see? To hold the situation. See?

C/S, people standing around, you know, "Yak, yak, yak, you know, well I audited out the...I had a lot of bank, and ga ta dee dee..." And they don't do their jobs, and they drift off in the now-wow, and there's nobody on the sea, that it's all sort of tumble-bumbled and stupid, and so forth. Oh yeah, get ethics in. You're not going to get tech in unless you get some ethics in. You can get it in hard, suddenly and shockingly, or you can get it in on a gradient. It doesn't much matter how you get it in. But you get ethics in. You start assigning some conditions. And when things have gone this bad, brother, it is not a condition of emergency. It is not a condition of emergency because when tech goes out in an area you're liable to have even government flaps in that area. That's how, that's how bad it is. So an organization which has out tech is attracting the lightning right down on the back of Scientology, boy. And you never really have government flaps or anything like this in areas where tech has stayed in. Because there're too many satisfied people, there's too many friends. See? But when tech slips, and it isn't working anymore, then it doesn't seem worth while.

When morale is bad in an organization tech had to go out in the first place. If tech is out, if it's invalidated, if it isn't being done right, if it's non-standardized, if it's shoved all over the place, then you can be absolutely sure that morale will be going out because there is no reason for anybody to be there.

Scientology, badly applied, is nothing to protect. And that's why you have to get tech in in a hurry. And the way you get tech in in a hurry, when it's madly out, is you put ethics in hard and follow it straight up with tech. Then you will find the cycle will go on through, and admin follows in afterwards. And then you have ethics, tech and admin are all in.

Now if you find ethics is having to stiffen up, if you're getting more ethics than you would normally predict, and if ethics is stiffening up beyond anything that anybody thought was necessary, then you know very well that tech has slipped, and slipped badly, and that the reports that you are getting must be; and it follows true. It isn't just a reasonability; it must be that the technical reports you are getting are false reports.

Now you can correct that up in numerous ways. You can convene some kind of a board of investigation or something, and call back fifteen PCs, and have them interrogated with regard

to this sort of thing. "What were the results? What happened in the sessions?" And that sort of thing. And all of a sudden something will come to light. You've had a tiger walking all over the place.

These are the situations which you meet. These are the situations which you have to handle. Now a lot of auditors trained on this course will find that they are going back to become the lonely only. The smart thing to do is to remain a lonely only for as brief a time as possible. An organization which does not invest its' money in getting an adequate number of fully trained Class VI's is gonna fall on its' head technically. And then, when Class VII's find themselves in a lonely only it's alright to play god, by all means. It's pleasant. But shove somebody else along to become a Class VIII, because it's a very lonely business being god. He is the most lonesome fellow you ever heard of.

Now you try to hold the fort on your lonely only. All by your little lonesome. Or with just maybe one other or two other VII's in the great, swarming organization, which is very busy, and people tearing in and out of the place, and people with their little ant-like two cent opinions based on data that is so cheap as to not be comparable to any coin on the planet. Including a milroy, which I don't think would buy one corner of one cigarette paper. Their opinions aren't worth shucks. Tech goes out. And you stand there flat footed and let tech go out. And let me tell you, you're gonna have more trouble than you can cope with with a regiment of marines.

Tech goes out, all of a sudden ethics starts going in. When ethics starts going in hard it very often goes in incorrectly. The next thing you know, tech, if not put in right at that time, why, a surfeit of ethics tends to start carrying the organization down instead of bringing it back up.

So your steps and actions, if the organization is in turmoil, if the administration is bad, if people are not doing what they're supposed to be doing, if it's all sort of mucky and mucked-up and you hear people around and they're going, "Nya nya nya nya nya nya, and nya, nya nya nya nya nya", well just don't order everybody to be sec checked. To hell with that. But all that it is is that tech is out. Tech is out, man. How to get it in. That's your problem. How do you get it in?

The solution is put in ethics like a ton of bricks. And then follow right along behind it with good, standard tech! And put it in hard! And what do you know? The ethics come right off of it. Ethics will not lift itself out. All ethics will do is hold the fort while you're getting tech in. If you don't hold the fort at all you won't get any tech in. I can tell you that by experience. Oh, you can be charming, you can be persuasive, you can give them talks, you can do everything you want to, but you have to hold their hands while they're auditing the PC. And you ain't gonna get there because the environment is inadequately filled with challenge.

Man thrives on challenge. One of the reasons why it's dangerous to have an AO in a California climate. The only challenge in it is smog. No slur on California. I'm very fond of California.

But the net result of this is, I'm trying to teach you a lesson which is just as standard as standard tech. It's how do you apply the technology which you've got to the area in which you gonna operate. You gonna walk home, everybody's gonna be very glad to see you, gonna put you on a pedestal, "You're a great guy. You know your stuff." You graduated and so on. You're a Class VIII! Great! They're gonna agree with everything you say. Next thing you're gonna hear is invitations to squirrel. "Well, Bessy Ann, yes. What about her case? You know? We could have her in specially and you can audit her, and we've never been able to crack her case. You know, we've done all the usual things. You know, you're gonna tell us now that it's solved by the usual things. We've tried all those. We've done all those. And can't we get in Bessy Ann? We can get a lot of money if you can audit her. And we've advertised every place that you're going to audit specially for us." ummm. "In fact we had one psychotic PC whose brother owns the steel mill, see, and we've got that all lined up for you." Well how do you extricate yourself from such traps and get the show on the road? Well, you will assume unto yourself some ethics presence of some kind or another. Now the wrong way to assume it is to give them, try to teach them a Class VIII course in the next five minutes after arrival. Or to

impress them with what you now know. They know you know it anyhow. You don't have to tell 'em. What you have to do is an ethics presence. So you have to point out to the people in your immediate vicinity if ethics is out in the area, that ethics is out. And that ethics has to be put in so that you can help put tech in. And you do the maximum you can in order to do so.

Now some EC that is very enthusiastic about making some bucks, but not enthusiastic about running any standard tech, which they may consider a waste of time or something of this sort, may louse it up a little bit. But that's a job endangerment chit, because you as a Class VIII are being counted on to get tech in in your area. So it's a job endangerment, isn't it?

So therefore you're gonna have the terrible problem of, the EC will figure that you are now above them, the Executive Council figures you are now above them so therefore you ought to be stepped on, put you in your place. You're even liable to get in a condition where you get a whole long series of ethics conditions assigned to you because you put up a small argument on the subject that you wouldn't process the brother of the steel mill. The way you solve that, the way you solve that is to insist that ethics goes in, and goes in correctly. Because a Class VIII has to know a great deal about ethics. You have to insist that ethics goes in, and you say, "Ethics is necessary to go in so that we can get tech in, and then we're going to go get tech in."

Now right now I see that when PCs report for sessions the auditors are seldom there. They wander in a half an hour from now. Or don't appear at all, or something. Well that's an immediate and automatic condition of non-existence, with conditions enforced. Guy isn't there, non-existence.

Somebody's going to start arguing with you about this. Well let me call to your attention that all the Sea Org is interested in, and all they're interested in, is getting tech in on the planet. Now it may sound like we're trying to get ethics in. But that's inevitable. We're trying to get tech in on the planet. We're trying to audit out the fourth dynamic engram and furnish an environment in which it can be done. And that is the general, overall objective of the Sea Org. We're trying to furnish an environment in which the forth dynamic engram may be audited out. And naturally we have to make sure that is also sets audited. Otherwise there would be no point in putting any ethics in.

There is no point in slaughtering all the people in Armenia under the heading that we were putting ethics in in Armenia. Ethics all by itself is pointless. All mans' justice is pointless, really pointless. Modern justice is a laugh. Just look at the number of times somebody returns to the penitentiary. Guy gets two years for stealing a car. He comes out at the end of two years, within four hours he's stolen a car. So he goes back in for three years. He comes out at the end of three years, he walks out and he steals a car. And then he goes in for ten years and at the end of that time, why he walks out and he steals a car. I mean, this is, this is not an uncommon record.

As a matter of fact it's so bad that it's as much as your life's worth apparently, to arrest a bank robber. His friends just simply get him out of jail at once by force. It's really, really quite remarkable. But all it is, is pointless punishment. In 1835 I think, in Philadelphia, they adopted what is currently passing for a justice punishment and penal system. And they found out that although there were many systems of punishment involved, they found this out by careful observation; one that was used in Philadelphia where the fellow was put in a little cell with bars, was the least workable, and had the most returns. And that is the one that has been used ever since. The modern penitentiary system is found to be the least workable in the rehabilitation of the criminal.

Now the cop should be charged with public safety. The chief of police is obviously responsible for public safety. Ten percent of the people cause ninety percent of the accidents. There is no action ever taken to make sure that those ten percent don't drive, or are fixed up. As a matter of fact, every time you try to put in the program it gets fought. It's just as though people want to see people smashed. Yet it's a criminal action, killing people on the highways- That's manslaughter. And yet nobody takes any real efforts. They want to slow everybody down.

Well if you slow all the cars down you put more cars on the road per hour. And if all cars are slowed down then your traffic is so jammed that nobody can drive in it. It isn't really speed that causes accidents. Some accidents are caused by speed. But you'll find out that somebody speeding normally had to speed around the dear old soul who was driving down the exact middle of the highway, so as not to run off either side at fifteen miles an hour.

So public safety, robbery, burglary, sudden death and so on, is the business of the chief of police of an area. Or the superintendent. That's his business. He doesn't even know it's his job. It's not phrased in his textbook. His primary purpose is public safety. He thinks your replying to the fact that little automobiles and bicycles ought to be patrolled more closely. Safety to him is automobile traffic. Or safety to him is something else. So they arrest Luke the Glook, and they send him across the river because the judge got a, his defense got a psychiatrist or something to say he was insane, they send him across there, he gets checked out as being perfectly OK, and released the following day. It's common practice in Washington, D.C. Standard practice. Somebody's caught robbing a bank, or something like that, he goes across the river to Saint Elizabeth, and they release him the next day. Pleads insanity. Sometimes they spend two or three months around Saint Elizabeth, but that's about all. Most remarkable Proceeding you ever saw. Talk about reward of a down stat. If the guy can prove he's loony, why he's not guilty.

Well this kind of drives the chief of police around the bend, but he doesn't, he doesn't really object to this. So they take this guy and they throw him into the court, and a very usual procedure, and they give him a couple of years, or something like that. And then he goes over and he's released on parole, back on the public, unrehabilitated in any way, shape or form, to do the same thing that he did before, just eight months afterwards. And then after he does it again, why they pick him up, if they find him, and they put him in the court again, and then they put him in the penitentiary system they know, everybody knows didn't ever work, and then he's back on the public again, and so forth. You get the idea? This is the cycle by which all this occurs. This is public safety? That is justice for its' own sake. Not to get anything done.

Let us take putting in justice in a provence in France. I'll, let us say, 1550. Robbery, murder, sudden death is occurring in the provence. Somebody rides in on the place, starts picking up all these marauders and bandits, and that sort of thing, hanging a few of them, pushing a few of them into some other zone or area, telling them to be good, and it all quiets down. Now, let's look, just give you an odd example. That was one of the ways this sort of thing was handled in medieval times a lot. But what's the purpose? There was a purpose then. The purpose was so that the peasants and middle class and aristocracy of the provence could produce in peace, and have the results of their production, and possession of their land, and live lives which weren't suddenly being interrupted by a spear or arrow. There was a point. A point. See? There was a point. You calmed it down so's people could get on with it. And that was clearly thought in 1550. That was very clear think. There wasn't any fumble-bumble about it. Nobody had a dim idea of it. Marauders, operating in an area, reduced the production and fixed it up so the citizens and people of that area could not lead normal lives, and they couldn't get on with it, and there was no production. And it all went to hell in a balloon. So it was necessary to put law and order in on the area so that it would calm down and things could get straightened up, and people who had a right to live decent lives could go on and live decent lives. And there was no question about it. Has nothing to do with modern justice.

You may think that think still occurs, but it doesn't. Justice is put in for its' own sake. Hasn't anything to do with public safety. So they arrest all the criminals in the town and throw them in jail, but in a sort of a sequence, so at any given time there are so many criminals in the population. And then they put them in jail for a while, and release them back in to the population, to take the place of the criminals who've just been arrested and taken out of circulation.

Any time some group starts rioting or causing civil disorder, tearing shops apart or something like that, why you give them more money. Give them more votes. Anybody who was trying to keep the peace in 1550, if he were to look at the year 1968 he'd be kind of pop-eyed. Because

for quite a while anybody who tried to stop a riot was arrested. Most remarkable situation you ever heard of. All you had to do was try to stop a riot, if you were a cop, and you went out and tried to stop the riot, why you got thrown in the clink by the federal government. Now I'm not advocating desperate law and order, or anything of the sort, but it's all pointless. Why is there anybody there trying to do anything anyhow, because the riots are just increasing, and nobody goes in and picks up the people who were starting the riots so nobody gets to the basis of the civil engram which is bringing the riot, of which the riot is simply a symptom. Nobody really gets to the basis of it. All they do is start rewarding down stats and chopping the police up, and all kinds of weird, wild things. But there isn't any point in even doing anything about it. Nobody has any point in doing anything about it. Do you understand?

Justice gets a bad name only when it itself is pointless. And in Scientology justice is pointless, ethics is pointless, if it does not bring in standard tech. Completely pointless. There isn't any reason for it. Why ever assign a condition? To hell with it. Let them go out and lie in the gutter. If you weren't going to follow it in with standard tech, what the hell? Why assign any condition at all?

So, what you've got to look at here is how do you get standard tech in? Well one, you have to know it. There has to be such a thing, and somebody has to know there is such a thing. And he has to be able to demonstrate that that thing is beneficial. And is something that should be preserved. That sounds terribly elementary, but you'd be surprised at the number of people that are walking around in some airy-fairy cloud that don't know that. And then he has to hold the fort long enough to get it in. And, rightly or wrongly, the only test of which is, I still seem to keep the show on the road, century after century. I always hit an ethics area that is an out-ethics area, hard, until I can get those elements straightened up which made it a mess. And that's gone on for a very long time.

It hit an area in Asia Minor, something like this, like a ton of bricks. Bongo! Until I could get it into production. Until I could get it situated, calmed down, divided up, get an economy forwarded, get things straightened out, holding that ethics in hard, boy. Holding justice in hard. Hold it in hard. All somebody had to do was sneeze and that would be that. See? Hold it in hard. This is the way we're going, this is the edges, there we get This is what we're supposed to be doing. This is squared up. And then, pretty soon, there's enough production, enough abundance, enough this, enough that, you start etching it off. Easing it off, easing it off.

You, one, have to know that you have to put it in hard to begin with, and two, you have to know when to ease it up. And you ease it up to the degree that the technology that you're trying to import into the area is functioning. Simple. You ease it up to the degree that the technology you're trying to put in is functioning. It is an exact measurement.

For instance, I'm trying to build up; I'll give you... It goes along with other types of economy. Trying to build up a port in Asia Minor, see? Got nobody but a few squads of troops. No dough, nothing Could build it right up to the stars, just put in ethics, justice, hard into the area, move it up, say this is where we're going, get the agreement of people to go in that particular direction, build it up, holding that in hard, not letting it be knocked over and every time you've got a sheaf of wheat up not letting some bunch of bandits come in and grab it. Square it up, square it up, push it ahead. But all the time there was technology moving in on the area. True, the technology of the arts and human arts. But a technology was moving in. And the technology would build up, people would learn what is was, keep carrying it forward. Ethics, and then as they started learning this, and so forth, ease off. I'd know the job was done when troops were bored to death.

I like to see an ethics officer down to such a point that he searches over the entire area, pitifully turning over a match in his hand which was dropped in the hall, as the only crime he can discover anyplace. Along about that time, why, the conditions are upgraded. That is to say, you don't suddenly start upgrading everybody, but the condition you are assigning is lighter. That is the proper condition for that time.

So, there is another rule. It requires a bit of judgement. It is: The worse off things are, the harder condition is assigned for the same crime. You don't always have a uniform code of justice. When you're going in there as case supervisor for the first time, and somebody says, "PC felt wonderful. Floating needle all through the session so I didn't do it." And when the PC got to the examiner with the needle stuck tight and the TA at four and a half, there is something very wrong here.

Now if you start to involve yourself with what is wrong there at that stage of the game, you're going to be so, you're going to be rewarding a down stat. You're going to be training somebody who is really gonna goof the floof. You don't bother to tell him. You don't even bother to tell him what's wrong. And you say, "False report. You're in doubt." Bong! "Ah, ah, you can't do that to me." "Oh no, not only can't do that to you, if you insist on something else, why we might really come to blows here over this thing."

The essence of the situation is that ethics is out all over the place because tern has been long out, so the only excuse you have to use ethics at all is to get tech in! So it becomes a hell of a crime. The examiner talks to the person as he's examined. It's a non-compliance with orders, liability for the examiner. Just like that. No arguments about it. And the examiner's, he's been on post for a long time, he knows his business, and PCs come in, "Well how you doing? Well I didn't think very much of that auditor anyhow. I'd see... We'll get on the cans nere. I don't suppose you're very bad off because, I hope you're OK. You seem to be alive. Let's see now. You had what? At your state of the case? Well. What do you know?" Well he went in liability and he did it the next day, and he went into doubt, and he did it the next day, and he went into enemy. Just like that.

All of a sudden you are liable to have qualms. You say, "Now look. If I'm insisting that conditions of this character are assigned with this violence, the whole organization is going to fall to pieces, people are going to say I came back suppressive. I've, everything is wrong and the whole staff will quit. And this, naturally, it's all going to fall apart. And we've only got six staff now, and..." Let me tell you by long experience that's the wrong line of think. The only reason you have small staffs is because ethics is out. Tech has gone out, ethics is out. And the only way you can actually increase the numbers of staff you have, is to put ethics in hard. You say, well Christ, people won't have anything to do with you if you do that. Boy that is a civilian think to end it all. Do you know the one organization which never has any trouble recruiting is an army. But there's a hell of a lot of manufacturers patting people on the head that can't get anybody to work for 'em. That's interesting, isn't it? An individual feels safe in a harshly disciplined environment.

You forget that a guy wandering around out there someplace is being shot down in flames by people in his immediate vicinity, who are making mistakes and goofing up, loading their hats onto him, and so on. If you look at everything from your own viewpoint only, you will not notice that guys who do not have your altitude, who do not have your ability, do not have your command of technology, are really getting kicked in the stomach. They are much more kicked in the stomach by the loafer, the bum, the natterer, the guy who doesn't do his job, than they will ever be kicked in the stomach by ethics. And they don't, don't feel safe in an environment where ethics is out. It outrages them. It outrages the principles and reasons they're there. And when ethics is out in an area, bad staff stays and good staff leaves. And when ethics goes into an environment hard, you will find that good staff stays and bad staff leaves. It's just as inevitable as anything.

We just got through sending a Sea Org officer to an organization, to take over as something the organization had never had before. You say we don't have any right to do this. Actually we've got a right to do anything we please, as long as it goes in the direction of trying to straighten something out. Because that organization threatens the whole economy of an area. They over spent themselves, and they messed it up, and it's going to really take some doing to put it back together again. Sea Org officer walked in, started shooting people down in flames, and instantly they had three or four blows. Immediately the rest of the staff united very strongly.

The whole organization I think was put in non-existence. They started working all day and all night to catch up all their backlogs. And now we've found out that the three or four people who blew were apparently getting rake offs from merchants in the vicinity. And were putting it in their pockets. In other words, the organization had gone crooked, financially.

Well when the tough guy arrived the good guys stayed and the bad guys blew. Now let me tell you. Had we sent a member of the Bide-a-Hee Goodwill Society, all the good guy would have blown and the bad guys would have stayed. Because they could have kidded her, see? Do you get this? These are sound, hard principles. These are facts. These have to do with homo sapiens, these have to do with beings, these have to do with planets. People do not feel safe in out-ethics areas.

Right now the people of the United States at this particular time and period do not feel safe because riots are liable to spring up at any time, any place. A shop keeper can't call his soul his own because anybody, apparently, has a right to walk in, smash the windows, and say, wI'm a rioter. And this is all because I don't have zilch. Ha ha, ha ha. Therefore, I can break your window, and everything." And some cop tries to arrest him, the COP is immediately thrown in prison for interfering with civil rights. What the hell do you think, what the hell do you think is gonna happen to that economy?

We speak of technology as an economy. What do you think's gonna happen to it? It's gonna go broke, that's whatts gonna happen to it. Its' money's going to devaluate, and be worth less and less. Its' production's going to be less and less valuable. Security is going to be less and less. And people will be less and less happy to be part of that country.

Now one of the unstabilizing things in countries today is the definition of a sovereign power. You don't think that has very much to do with Scientology. It has a great deal to do with it. Because the international law definition of a sovereign power is as follows: That government which can protect the lands and people from foreign aggression is, by fact and definition, the sovereign power of that area.

What did the atom bomb do? There isn't a government on earth can protect its' lands or its' people from foreign aggression. All some slap-happy nut has to do in any part of the world today; with I don't know how many countries have atom bombs; flop an atom bomb at any count y in the world. And there is goes. Booms And therefore, what does that mean? That means that the governments of nations today cannot protect their government, cannot protect their people, cannot protect their land from foreian attack. Because there is no defense against that weapon. They know this, they're unstabilized, they're dispersed, and they know they are fakes. They know they're fakes. They know they can't protect the land and people. So therefore they're just sort of, tax hungry bums. They're sort of marauders, like locusts. So they don't get in ethics because they think of their technology as something that is dwindling, something that is going, something that's losing.

While you are moving in as a vital, new thrust of life. Your technology is not solidly moved into the community. Your technology is not solidly moved into the nations of the world at this particular speaking. Funny part of it is, I notice in ads and other places, that they're beginning to use Scientology phraseology, and Scientology think, more and more. This is always a flatter. This always flatters it. They've sort of heard on it, on the undercurrent. They sort of think in those terms more and more. Simply preparing the way.

A vital philosophy is always preceded by a gradual change in the area it is being introduced into. The area starts picking up its' phraseology. Starts picking up its' technology, starts getting expressed in the arts, long before the people have even heard of it. But this is a vital new waye. It's a vital new waye. Justice for the old orders become pointless. Why should they get in justice? Why should they even arrest anybody and throw them in jail? They're just going to let him out again. And if they do arrest the guy, why it isn't going to improve production any. Because there is no... That's gone. We're looking at a dying scene. It doesn't realize how fast it is dying.

We belong to a new world. And as we move forward we have our own ways of handling things. And the think that goes along with it is, that as long as any area which we control we can keep tech precisely practiced in that area and not squirrelled in any way, as long as we can keep that, morale will stay up, ethics will be relatively light, prosperity will be considerable, and everything will go along great. But when that breaks down we have to put ethics in to the degree that we have to put it back together again.

But now, as we approach a new area where our technology is not in at all, ethics of course has to go in very hard. 'Cause our tech is so out as to be in a condition of non-existence in that area. And right now we're really suffering from the fact that we haven't taken full responsibility for all mental treatment, all psycho somatic treatment, on the entire planet. We're actually shrinking away from cur responsibility to that degree. And we're paying for it.

It's inevitable then, that area in which you will not take responsibility, that area in which you will not take responsibility is going to kick you in the teeth, bud, to be philosophic about it. But therefore, as you move in, as you move forward, you're moving into areas where tech is out. Books, things like that, would precede your actual contact. And you'll find out people have picked up these books, they've squirrelled, they've done this, they've cross-advised, they've messed it up. The cycle has been very, very rugged and ragged, and so forth, to the degree then that the idea's that a lot of squirrels would have arisen and people mucked up, and you'll be running into guys who are running engrams backwards and upside down, see? And the area's getting muddled up all the time. Right ahead of you, your area's muddled up. So actually it's followed with a wave of ethics. And you say, "Well the public is really staying away from an organization." It works the same way with the public it works with the staff. If you want all the lousy public in the world let ethics go out. All the good public'll stay away from you. If you want good public to move in, put ethics in. The bad public'll stay away and the good public'll come in.

This is a hard thing to learn, but you can eventually get reality on it. And it goes hand in glove with what you're trying to do. I know very well that people to whom I am talking now and in the future will be facing, time and time again, being a lonely only, having a rough time of it, being argued with about this, that and the other thing. The type of arguments you get into are so nonsensical as to be unbelievable. You know, it's, "Well how do you explain, how do you explain the fact there are more and more people, there are more and more people on the planet? Where are all the spirits coming from? Ba ha ha ha, hat Explain that now! Ha hat Ha hat Explain that! Ha ha. Ha. We got you there I guess. Ha ha ha. Anderson, Q.C., Melbourne inquiry. Complete gibbering psychotic idiot. Up to the gills with R-6. That was exactly, I think, what he said. You think I was just gagging it up, huh?

Scientology must be wrong, because we cannot explain where all the new bodies come from. All the new spirits. Where would all the new spirits come from if everybody had a spirit, why where would all the new spirits come from, huh? Actually, what he didn't realize, this silly ass, he was disproving Catholicism. Catholicism claims there's one spirit per body, so he was asking some silly little kid question that is asked of his own religion, Catholicism. And yet he was busy hanging Scientology because it couldn't... You get the irrationality of it?

The man occupies a perfectly valid position. He's looked on. He's a queens' consulate. Actually he's just a gibbering idiot. You probably couldn't even catch him to get a straight jacket on him.

Birds like that, the society in which you operate, it's awarding down stats, it's got false ideas, things run backwards and upside down. And somehow or other you have to maintain your own level of truth. Now you will not show the wear and tear to the degree that you put in ethics. And to the degree that you fail to put in ethics you're going to show the wear and tear of it. That I can assure you.

Now you notice the Class VIII Course is taught in AOs, and is taught by the Sea Org. And the reason for that is, it is an ultimate in stabilizing technology. It is maybe not the last course that will ever be taught on the subject. But it certainly is an ultimate to this degree. It is standardization, standardization, standardization of approach, standardization of application, and standardization of result. And they all can go together. Which is quite a trick. Quite a trick. Standardization of auditing and auditors. There can't be any fire fights and arguments. It also happens that it is the right way to do it. It also happens there isn't any other right way to do it.

Some famous philosopher said there are two ways to do everything. And then didn't add the psychotic and the correct.

So I sympathize with anybody going to North Canyon Station, which only has in it anyhow a Scientology population of fifteen, because his tendencies will be because he is so weak, to do things so weakly. When there are not many of you you've got to be ten times as tough. You've got to be ten times as strong. And you would find out that your area and zone would move up and gather in strength and volume to the degree that you insisted on standard tech. This is quite true.

These are lessons which are not based on my opinions, but are lessons learned across the last eighteen years of trying to relay technology. It is interesting that in those eighteen years, in the practice and application of the technology itself, it has been relatively simple all the way along the line. What has made it complex is one, there was no language with which to communicate it. And two, people seemed to add to it faster than you could keep it stripped down.

Now, to give you some idea of how tech goes out in your area, you yourself at this stage of the game, undoubtedly have a reality on it. But maybe at some later time no reality will exist on it. You knew you had TR 1, you had TR 1 down sometime way in the past. You had it, that was the way it was. Somebody came along and he flunked you for it, or somebody said that wasn't the way you did it. Somebody said that was the way you did it a long time ago, but that isn't the way we do it now. Something happened that knocked out your TR 1. So you had it once, and now somebody cross questions it, invalidates it, it goes by the boards, and you somehow or other got to reacquire it again somewhere up the line. Well, you're reacquiring it fully, at VIII.

Now one of the ways that is happens is, in the research line two data are stated at different periods of research which seem to be in conflict. The earlier data happens to be correct, the second data is there because somebody remimeographed and misspelled the bulletin. So, somebody comes along and says the second datum is correct. They interpret the material. The material, since time immemorial, has needed no interpretation. Just recently, in trying to teach some materials I found this astonishing fact, that I was trying to tell people it was the simple basics, the very simple basics, that made the auditor. But the trouble with auditing is, it was too simple. And their grasp of the subject was difficult because they thought they were trying to grasp a lot more than they were trying to grasp. And it was trying to grasp this simple thing, and grasp that simply and continuously, and I'll be a son of a gun if the zone and area of trying to apply this didn't say, "Don't pay any attention to basics. What you want to study is the upper theory of the thing."

A Class VIII auditor should be a model of simplicity. He should have a grip on the simple things of life. He should know what he knows, he should know and see those things occur so that there is no difficulty with his head or somebody else's. But this sort of thing can happen. This sort of thing can happen.

It would amuse you very much that a few weeks ago I was doing a case supervision on a folder. And I looked at the commands that were given, and the reasonability, and the reason for these commands, and in reading the explanation of it all, and the folder, I got sufficiently confused that I sent for the original bulletin. And got it in, just to restabilize the situation. It was a really violent outness. But it was an insidious outness. Do you follow? It might possibly, at one time or another, have sounded reasonable, and it might at some time or another have been

worded that way. So I sent out for the original bulletin to find out if it ever had been worded that way. It never had been worded that way. In other words, even my data, at this particular point, could be so persuaded, so persuaded that I wanted to look it up. And it's almost unbelievable that I would look anything up. Because the data which you use are so well known to me that it strains my reality to have to tell them to you. And every once in a while I'll forget perhaps to tell you something, because I would never dream you didn't know it. See? I have to think. It's pretty difficult sometimes, to undercut it all the way. "Now let's see, what don't they know? What couldn't they possibly know?" Very often I have to really dream up a production trying to imagine what to get down to. Now it strikes me... I remember the first time this ever happened to me. It didn't happen to me. A guy was watching a TV demonstration. And he came in and he was absolutely starry-eyed, and he says, "I just found something that you do that none of the rest of us do in auditing. You acknowledge." And it never, I never would have dreamed of telling anybody they had to acknowledge. It was just so far beyond my reality that anybody would have to be told, don't you see? So I have a little bit of a hard time scaling it. It's not that I'm trying to undercut it, or talk down to anybody. It requires real skill and real ability to be totally simple. That is the test.

If you want to get a commentary on this read Professor Snorgborg's, or Smorgasborg I think his name is, dissertation on the Implausibility of Electronic Theory. The book is eight thousand six hundred and fifty five pages. It's in several sets. And it won't surprise you that he died because he didn't know how to push his doorbell and get in out of the cold. But boy it sure was complex. So you want to refer people that have complex things, you say, "Well why don't you read Professor Smorgasbord's dissertation on the Basic Theory and Reinterpretation of Scientology Theory? It's a very famous book." And send them down to the library to look for it if they've bothered you too much. And keep insisting that it is in the library. And it at least keeps them out of your hair, possibly for some years.

But to be basically, totally simple you have to be terribly, terribly direct. Terribly direct.

Now, the net result of all of this is, is with terrific simplicity you are trying to get forward a very simple, fantastically workable technology. The routine by which you get it in is also very simple. Morale goes out, and effectiveness and efficiency and administration goes out, to the degree that the tech itself goes out. To get the tech back in, or to get it in in the first place, you have to apply very straight, direct ethics. This is followed through by putting in tech. You ease up the ethics to the degree that you get tech practiced in a standard fashion. Do I make my point? And that is actually what it is all about.

Thank you very much.