

ARC STRAIGHTWIRE

A lecture given on
12 June 1963

Thank you. Now, let's see, this is the what? 12th of June?

Audience: 12th of June.

You get an extra lecture this week. That's because I just didn't feel like doing anything with blocking out engrams on somebody for an hour and then leaving them to some other auditor. It seemed unkind. I'll give you a demonstration on that next week probably.

But well, Saint Hill Special Briefing Course, just so you'll know where you are. And I want to talk to you now about a fundamental subject which I haven't discussed at length with you, and that is ARC Straightwire. This is very needful material, and it may seem very old to some of you because I'm sure that your earliest introduction to processing in any Academy was sitting down and struggling with ARC Straightwire and having it pointed out that the pc had not cycled to present time but had been left in the middle of the soup. And that was why the pc was cross or some such things. ARC Straightwire is the oldest broad process of a repetitive nature. It is the most ancient. And in actual fact, although I may be in error on this, I think is the first repetitive process.

You'll find the remains of the first version in modern publications of Self Analysis. That's the remains of the first version. But this process was based on the ARC triangle, and the ARC triangle was originated in July of 1950 in Elizabeth, New Jersey, and was expanded in its understanding that September or November in Los Angeles at the HDRF there. Now, this was a very important breakthrough on the field of the mind. A very important thing. To this day, there is no other single tool of the auditor that invites quite as much use or understanding and so forth as the ARC triangle.

Now, the best dissertation on the ARC triangle itself is to be found in Notes on Lectures. And that is the very best dissertation on that. It was rewritten from a series of lectures given in Los Angeles in 1950, and frankly has not been bettered as a statement.

Now, you should realize that the ARC triangle comprises in actual fact the most fundamental statement of significance. Although it apparently is addressed to the subject of matter, energy, space, time and significance and embraces all those things, it actually is the most fundamental basis of significance itself. It forms, you might say, a bridge between the pure postulate and the significance Of MEST. You can make a pure postulate, and it doesn't have to have any relationship to the ARC triangle. But the moment that a pure postulate becomes impinged upon matter, energy, space and time, it is immediately involved with this thing called ARC and ARC is the connecting link between the postulate and matter, energy, space and time.

Now, that matter, energy, space and time may—could be contained in the time track, or it may be contained in the physical universe. It doesn't matter what its location is. You understand, that a time track is actually a picture record of the physical universe and so in itself contains matter, energy, space and time.

Now, ARC of course means affinity, reality and communication. The first thing we run into a cropper on in trying to translate this, is the word affinity. Affinity is so much itself and is so relative, that we get into a considerable, to use a Texas word, hassle, in trying to interpret it in an auditing command generally.

Now, affinity has been very technically defined, and so has reality and so has communication. This is not a discussion of the ARC triangle. But for your information, the word affinity embraces everything from the Know to Mystery Scale. See, it embraces the lot and—as far as

these aspects are concerned. But it means—it means the feeling for or the feeling with or the lack of the feeling for or the lack of the feeling with, don't you see, and it definitely contains this connotation of feeling about, you see. And it's not enough to say emotional response, because a fellow who feels effortful about effort is still experiencing affinity about effort, see, his affinity about effort.

Now, sympathy, empathy, all of these things come into this, and it becomes one of these very broad subjects. And the word affinity is not an adequate word to discuss these things because the word has not existed in actual fact in any language. Because this concept has not been well embraced by any language. We're up against the semantics of the situation.

But if you take the Know to Mystery Scale and substitute it for the word affinity, and you use emotion and misemotion and such things as that, you're going to find the pc responding to it. Now, some people are only going to respond to the idea of love. They don't respond to emotion at all. Emotion isn't there, you see, and so forth. But nevertheless, love, this expresses affinity for them, you see.

And now when we say the emotional Tone Scale, we're talking about just a fraction of the Know to Mystery Scale. So everything on the emotional scale is under this head of affinity, clear from "hide" all the way on up. And there is your expression.

Now, how many words then can be used in any command containing the word affinity? That's a lot of them, isn't it? So, when we clear this command, we have to clear it in an understanding of what we mean by affinity. And we have this, this is all graphed. I mean, we've got it. That's broadly the Know to Mystery Scale and then part of the Know to Mystery Scale, the middle section, of course, is the whole Tone Scale. So we've got a lot of words there that we can clear.

And we'll find the pc chronically resident at one or another of these levels, and that of course is the level he will respond to in processing.

Now, on the word reality, reality could obtain in significance alone, you know—his reality is poor and so forth—to actual chunks of matter. You see, reality refers to all of these conditions but reality is normally considered to be considerations about something. It'll—considerations about something, or somebody, moving on up into the more solid concepts of just matter, energy, space and time. You see, space is a reality and energy is reality and matter is a reality and time is a reality. And so on. So, in clearing this word you will have less trouble. This word tends to clear itself with the pc more or less. He can get a grip on this word. He sort of knows what you're talking about. But if you had to vary it and the pc couldn't get a grip on this thing, it would be—it would be much harder to do. Much harder to do.

You would have to clear it something on the basis of whether it was matter, energy, space or time, you were talking about, or considerations about things, if he was totally in a thought response level, don't you see; or evaluations about things, or something of that sort. A harder word to clear, but you understand what you would be clearing.

You could ask somebody, you know, "What space have you rejected," see? I mean—and you're still asking this question of—number two question of the ARC triangle. You should recognize that that is its flexibility.

Now let's take communication. And we have the communication formula. And we mean any interchange, whether it's a bullet or a kiss. See, we have any interchange, with its consequent duplications and so forth. It's anything that fits under the communication formula. So in clearing that you also could move off of the idea of communication to the degree of a type or kind of communication. This is again less necessary. Communication is easy to understand.

But that could also contain the word duplication as well as communication. It could contain the word cause as well as communication, it could contain the word effect as well as communication, you see. What you're doing there is substituting various parts of the communication formula into that third auditing command in ARC.

When I speak then of clearing commands, it is a matter of substituting words in these three ARC commands so that the pc level of reality is met by the auditing command. And when we say clearing the command, we don't mean just does he understand this particular word that we keep hurling at him, but what word communicates what we're trying to communicate to him where we want to communicate at to, you got it?

So you can do a considerable amount of shifting around as long as you continue to hold to the ARC formula. And don't go shifting the thing around so that you ask the first question twice and the third question once and the first qu—you see? So that you say—you say for instance, you ask in actual fact two reality questions and one communication question and two reality questions and one communication question, because this thing is going to become unbalanced very fast.

Now, the fundamental understanding of the ARC process was contained in this: that those three things together equate to understanding—Affinity, reality and communication combined in their three selves, make understanding. And this, by the way, is something I never committed to paper, but I worked it out quite laboriously, mathematically and otherwise, in the autumn of 1950, and they actually do convert mathematically to understanding. It's quite interesting. There is no facet of understanding which falls outside of affinity, reality and communication.

And it takes all three of these things to bring about an understanding. When your pc has cognited, you possibly are not totally aware of the fact that he has reached a point of ARC. It's just as easy as that, you see. He's reached a point of ARC and this has expressed by a cognition. Well, of course, what is a cognition but an understanding? And the pc suddenly understands something. Well, you have established ARC here. And having established ARC you get a cognition. That tells you then that you're driving straight at it.

Now, oddly enough you won't get a cognition if you omit one of the legs. You just—just omit the A and run nothing but R and C and R and C and R and C and R and C, you'll find your pc, after a little while, no longer comes up with, "Well, what do you know..." That's the whole case there. You've unbalanced his understanding. That is what tends to make this such a powerful process, because it brings up one understanding on top of another understanding on top of another understanding, you see. And ARC should also have preserved with it—any statement about it—this very, very fundamental fact: That if you wish to raise C, which is stuck in the mud, you hit the A and the R. And if you wish to raise the R, which is stuck in the mud, you hit the A and the C. And if you wish to raise the A, you had better work on the R and C.

Now, that is terribly valuable. That is terribly valuable and must be preserved in any use of ARC processes. And the reason I give you this is already the mistake is being made: he can't answer the communication question so therefore we will run it session after session after session. Now, what is the error? The fellow can't grasp the communication side of it, why.?

Well, he does the R easily, you see, and he does the other one easily, but this one is stuck. So you'd better do the other two points. So any point which is overrun or more difficult will give trouble, providing you don't preserve the balance of the three questions.

Now, this gives us immediate trouble. It says "How do you know which one is flat?" Well, actually, please look at this: None—not one of those questions will ever flatten. You get that now? Only the three questions flatten, if anything is ever going to flatten, and it's very doubtful if you could even flatten the three. But if you've got three questions, you must flatten the three questions. It's the three questions you are trying to flatten. You are not trying

to flatten one question. So then don't make too many problems on when do we come off of this. When do we come off of this leg? Don't make too many problems there.

There are three ways to come off of a process. Three responses of equal length, you know, of equal comm lag, he gives you three responses; he replies to it three times at the same interval, even if it's half an hour each, see. Now, that's enough. That's enough. You can change a process on that shady reasoning. Now, that's the most crude method of changing a process, three responses. Equal length. Usually it's interpreted to mean "He answered it glibly three times, so we're away," see, that's usually interpreted to mean that.

All right, your next method... I remember in 17th ACC, I beat this home in a lecture, and the following day did the unforgivable thing of coming into class and asking the students one after the other what were the three signals which permitted you to leave a process. And not one of them knew. That was a terrible loss for me. I immediately invented the educational processes, which have—we haven't had much to do with.

But these three methods of ending a process become important to you in running ARC because you see you're flattening the triangle, you're flattening three questions, you're not flattening one. The next one is, of course, by cognition. Pc has a cognition, bail out.

I just saw an auditor get in their mid ruds at the end of session, and because there was one more to ask, didn't treat the mid ruds as a process. Pc cognited like mad on the session on the next to the last button, and the auditor got in the last button. The auditor unflattened the process. Get the idea?

This is a—this is a very interesting auditing tool, if it's sensibly used. In other words, pc has a cognition, to all intents and purposes you can consider the thing flat. But you have to leave it right then. You have to hit the silk with a loud "Geronimo," right at that point. Don't hang around monkeying with the ring. Right then, bail out.

"Well, how did you do on this process?"

You've had it, see. Pc says, "What do you know. You know..." You're running a communication process on him. "I hate people. Well, what do you know. I've often wondered about this. And I really basically hate people. I—I—that's what I've suddenly realized."

You say, "I'll give you this question two more times and end this process if that's all..." cut your throat, man.

So when you have to use that cognition process end, it's hit the silk, see? You say, "All right," as he's going on cogniting and talking about it you say, "that was the last command of that process."

See, handle it like Havingness. But when you bail out on a cognition, you really bail out and don't return the pc to the session, because the fastest thing you ever did in your life was unflatten one of these processes. You can flatten them and you just took one breath too many on the next command, you see. You said, "Well, all right, now, we're going to ask this question one more time and due to the fact that you've had a cognition. And are going to ask this question one more..." And that's it. You now have an unflat process.

See, so that one's very delicate. That's slippery. If you're going to use this one to end a process with, you end the process with it right now. You don't wait around. "That was the last command. All right, now we're going to take up the first leg of this which is 'What attitude has been rejected,'" see. Pc will be perfectly fine. Just smooth, man, he won't even notice anything is happening.

Your next one of course is tone arm action. Now, this in running the ARC triangle is the least reliable for any leg. The least reliable. It's the most desirable and the least attainable. It'd be

marvelous if the pc would promptly come down at the end of forty—five minutes of run on one question, would come down to exactly, the last ten minutes, .25 TA division. And then you would bail it out and you would do forty—five minutes on the next leg and it would come down, sweetly, precisely and obediently to .25 in ten minutes. I—you're saying the rule is twenty minutes. Well, in this one you can't afford twenty minutes to hang around and test, so you'd shorten it down to that much. And you're never going to find this Condition.

This is an unrealizable perfection. So you say, well, he's had a blowdown. So running by blowdown is a little more reliable. But you can't count on him blowing down at exactly forty—five minutes either. So your TA motion is your least reliable bail—out although you would look at it mechanically as your most reliable. No, your TA is terribly valuable because you can't come off the process until it's not producing tone arm reaction. But the process is three questions.

Now, you're running "In auditing," and the—running the three questions "In auditing." And one of these legs, oh, man, it goes on up to 4.2, and it comes down and so forth, and the other two don't seem to be producing much action, but this reality, boy, that goes up and it comes down, and you just better continue your process. You've got two that are apparently flat, but the third is not flat. You can't come off of that. Or actually alter the amount of time given to each leg until you get that process flat.

The way to flatten that process on reality is to continue to equally run with reality, affinity and communication. See your trick? Just because he wasn't flat on reality don't go beating reality to death. Because what's going to raise it is going to be affinity and communication legs.

All of this is—seems rather elementary for me to be talking this way. I started out with a very good academic approach, and all of a sudden come off to very fast and factual processing tips. But these are the things which are going to give you the trouble with the process, these little adjudications. "Wha—what—what, uh, what—what—huh uh huh...? What do I do now?" He says he absolutely hates this communication leg; he runs this reality leg like hot butter. Inevitably it would seem to mean that you had to flatten the communication leg when as a matter of fact the thing that'll get him out of it is running the reality and the affinity and the communication leg equally. So therefore, we have a process which can be handled in numerous ways, but which has very firm beginnings and has never really departed from our roster.

The first thing I ever found—to get back to an historical dissertation on this—first thing I ever found this process doing was breaking neurosis. And that's the old one that's registered in Self Analysis. I think that's quite interesting. You can take somebody who is strictly fruitcake, you could pour champagne on him or brandy on him and light him up for Christmas, you know, and he'd do all right. And run that process for a relatively short space of time. If it's going to produce this type of reaction that process is going to produce it right now. It's going to produce it fast. And you run it for a short space of time on him and all of a sudden, why he's bright and smiling and quite sane and not worried about something.

Now, I've seen it do that. And therefore the process has very firm grounding, as far as I'm concerned. And the only cases I have ever had trouble with the old process on, were cases that just got the same answers over and over and over and never made a breakthrough. They never broke through into anything else. They apparently just go on getting the same answers.

Now, that's the liability of the positive process of 1950, that on many cases it simply grinds down to a finite number of answers and that is it. Now, what's the matter? Why does it do that? Well, you're not heading in the direction that that case heads. You're heading toward positive ARC and their moments of positive ARC are so few as to be countable on the commands of one auditor. See, very brief period of time. And they quickly run out of these things because you're in actual fact running, if you want to know the truth of it, pleasure

moments of some kind or another. And they won't flatten. So you just run the same ones over and over and over. So you have to run the reverse side of it.

I've paid attention to this process and have revived it, and done things with it and fooled about with it from time to time, and now and then you'll see records of it as it goes along over the years. But about 1958 we ran into a period there when I was suddenly colliding with some implants and didn't know quite what to do about it, were running a great deal of reach and withdraw type of thing and so forth, and raising IQ of people rather easily, and so forth.

All—you want to raise somebody's IQ, you know, there's a standard process for it, just as a little interjection here. Just say, "What could you withhold? Thank you. What could you withhold? What could you withhold? What could you withhold? What could you withhold? What could you withhold? What could you withhold? What could you withhold? What could you withhold? What could you withhold?" Give them another IQ test, and their IQ will have gone up about twenty—five, fifty points. They won't be any better, but their IQ will be higher. Quite interesting. That's a funny phenomenon for you.

Also, plunge them into an engram, run it halfway through and give them another IQ test and they'll be smarter. That works. I'm not kidding you. That—it works. Why? Well, apparently it has something to do with mass. And people who think only on the mass which they have to think with, see, can get mechanical responses required in IQ tests. You understand, I said it was an IQ test that you were trying to raise. You're not trying to make him any smarter. See? And they always get a better IQ test. It's, it's quite interesting.

Now the upsets that you run into, however, on a case, are not the ease's pleasure moments. You run up in the upsets on a case of times when they were knocked away from being part of things. The separateness or individuation. Or were forced to be part of things they wanted nothing to do with. In other words, you had a power of choice or of connect and disconnect. And that power of choice is overthrown. And when that power of choice is overthrown you get what you call an ARC break.

He was there but didn't want to be there. He wanted to be there but couldn't be there. Now, those are causes of ARC breaks in their most fundamental form. It actually is an overwhelm of the person's power of choice. Pc wants—you can get an ARC break: pc wants to go earlier on the track and you send him later on the track. Well, that in itself causes an ARC break, regardless of any charge or mechanics or anything else. You've overwhelmed his power of choice. So you have an ARC break.

This is the most fundamental of ARC breaks. And I wondered in 1958 whether or not you couldn't just run Straightwire on (quote) "ARC breaks." Well, the Scientologist knows what an ARC break is, he sort of feels it in his bones, doesn't have to have it designed or described to him any other way than that, and you just ask the question, "Recall an ARC break. Recall an ARC break. Recall an ARC break. Recall an ARC break."

Now, if you were to move on down the line with that process on anybody that could run it, you would find him sitting—and I did on my experiments at that time—find him sitting square in the middle of implants. So an implant was the biggest ARC break. He was being held in a place where he didn't want to be, being told things and, you see, that he didn't want to hear. So this overthrew his power of choice and for numerous other reasons it went against his grain. But this was the most fundamental overthrow of the power of choice. And this 1958 process—"Recall an ARC break" is the exact process—does some rather interesting things.

So when we got into the Helatrobus Implants here recently, I did a hasty review of all ARC processes and—it wasn't very hasty, I fooled around with it for a couple of weeks, looking over this material, and so forth—and finally exhumed the original version, reversed, and worked it out mechanically and mathematically to fit up to the exact situation of what I knew about these things. And I got quite a bit of information about these things, which isn't only confined to that which works, don't you see? I know lots of things that don't work. And

that's very valuable too. So I knew these had always worked, so I decided to throw together these processes in some sort of form where they would clip directly into and saw out of—saw out pieces of an implant. We needed a process which was senior to any other process we were doing, which was a repetitive process. That was our demand.

We also needed a process to cut through those cases which were at the lower levels of the Reality Scale, and therefore couldn't be directly run on RIs and things of this particular character. What are you going to do, just abandon these people? What are you going to do with somebody who is terribly misrun and mishandled?

And I made an interesting discovery at this time, that the big mid ruds or the 18—button prepcheck, but mainly the big mid ruds, run on an engram, mushed it. It turned it into so much porridge. Messed it up. It tended to spoil the record, not eradicate it. That's interesting, isn't it? An engram frays around the edges and starts turning into pure energy, and that sort of thing. But without returning to the pc, as far as I could tell—although I could revise my opinion of this—without returning to the pc any memory of what did happen. Quite interesting.

In other words, this demonstrated that if you were going to use to a great extent big mid ruds and big Prepchecks on—big lists of buttons on pcs who are stuck in engrams, you weren't going to unstick him out of engrams. You're going to brighten them up and polish it off and straighten up sessions and doing a lot, but this tool is a light tool. It's a light tool. It's the—it's the kid's sand shovel. See? And what we had to have there was that great big Caterpillar tractor—tread steam shovel. And it had to be powerful enough so that it wouldn't buck just because you shoved it into a rocky ledge. That thing had to go on through.

Well, the most there to go through is an implant, and the only thing I knew that would cut through implants is the ARC type process. And so I re—evolved these processes and we came up with the negative ARC processes. That's what these really are. And they call for moments when there wasn't any, or there was minimal, affinity, reality and communication.

Then I made a further discovery about these things. And I found out that a pc was operating on entanglements with the physical universe and all that, and considerations and postulates and all that sort of thing, and it was one thing to bail him out of his intricate entanglements with matter, energy, space and time and considerations, but that there was something else operating which was his consideration of his entanglement, see. And that was the other factor.

Well, I'll give you some reality on that. We walk out here and we find a porter. And this porter's working in this windy, miserable, dust—ridden, soot—drenched station, see. Oh, my God, I mean, it's a mess, you see. And gusts of London breeze are blowing through the places and throwing the coal dust into everybody's eyes and the tips are very poor and the stationmaster is a bum that's always coming down on the porters and you know, it's all—it's all very bad. And we find this bird there, and he's happily picking up people's valises and throwing them on trains and walking around and he doesn't seem to have much of a care in the world about it.

And then we turn around and we find another guy right alongside of him, and my God, anybody asks him to pick up one corner of a trunk, Hwaa! Majesty has been insulted. If you gave him a ten—pound tip he still would have been undertipped, you see. He is what you might characterize as unhappy with where he is.

Well, here are two fellows in the same environment, same pay, same situation, same everything, don't you see, and they have two different attitudes about what they're doing. All right, we go over to the Ritz Biltmore and we find two bellboys. And actually labor relations in that place are so smooth, they have been taken care of by the union delegates so well and so forth, that even the—even the assistant night clerk who is the most important man in the place as everybody knows, has to say "sir" to the bellhops. You see? The tips, my God—nobody walks into this place, you see, without dropping a fiver in somebody's paw, you see.

And it's nothing, nothing there, they get all the chow they want, they get everything they want, they have beautiful uniforms, girls whistle at them, everything is fine, you see.

You get two blokes there and one of these fellows, why, he's just happy as a clam to be there. And the other fellow, every time you hand him a five—pound note he goes back of a pillar or something like that and practically spits his teeth out with rage. Well, you know that these conditions exist.

And you know that people—you may have—you may believe at first glance that if the surroundings are bad, the people are unhappy. And if the surroundings are good, people are happy. There's many people get caught in this. And the most people who get caught in it are by the way your—your sociologists. They have never apparently learned this.

The United States—the United States is having an awful happy time right now pouring billions into foreign aid, so these dirty, filthy, fly—ridden grass huts in Balooga—uga—uga—stan can all be torn down and they can put in nice seven—bedroom ranch houses with hot and cold running politicians throughout. And they're just having a ball. And nobody is more surprised or will be more surprised than the United States government at the end of a period of time to find out that the exact proportion of “hate the United States government” and “love the United States government” exists as before. They might even have gone over toward “hate it” before, to the degree that they actually enforced people to live in these seven—bedroom ranch houses, see.

Because you talk to a boy in Blooga—uga—uga—uga—stan and he's liable to tell you something on this order: “Ah, nice house, yeah, nice house. Yeah, reeds, reeds, nice reeds, side of a river, nice reeds. Wife there to raise some yams and so forth, and nice reeds, very thin walls.” So you say, “What do you mean, very thin walls?” He's kept crooning over this idea of these thin reeds, you know. And you—it doesn't sound like this guy's very smart. And he looks at you like you're crazy.

And he says, “Well, of course, very thin reeds.”

“Yeah, but what about these reeds?”

Oh, man! He says, “You can go out that wall, that wall or that wall.” That's his idea of a house.

Now, that factor, that wild, weird factor that keeps rattling around all over the place, gets into the machinery and cogwheels of more social planning and messes up more great schemes and so forth, than any other single factor. In fact it is the only factor that does mess up these things. And that's just power of choice.

Now, you could call it preference, or you could call it this or call it that, but it just happens to be the fellow's attitude toward where he is and what's happening. It's his preference. I use the word “attitude” carelessly there.

It's either all right or it isn't all right, and to that degree it's whether he understands it or doesn't understand it. Don't you see? It's—also could go under the heading of whether he wants it or doesn't want it, and so forth. But in actual fact all of these factors, however you express it, are incomplete statements until you express it completely as affinity, reality and communication.

Now, that's a complete statement of this. And the pc has had all those things present with regard to all these circumstances all up and down the track. And that's an adequate statement of power of choice, and it's not a packaged statement that can be stated in one brief word. That has to be stated in terms of affinity, reality and communication. And if you try to overstate it on one of those corners of the triangle, you're going to mess up the other two corners and you're going to overthrow power of choice, don't you see?

It's quite interesting. It brings up this: is there such a thing as an ideal state? I don't mean an ideal nation, I mean an ideal condition of beingness. Is there such a thing as an ideal state? Well, I was quite amazed. I was quite amazed in looking over the whole track to find out that there was some awful unhappy big thetans on the backtrack. They were bored, they didn't have anything to do. That sort of thing, you'd say, "Well, that fellow was in an ideal state."

No, he wasn't in an ideal state. And neither was anybody else. And the faintest possibility of anybody ever achieving an ideal state exists in Scientology and has never before existed in this universe. That's an interestingly broad and fantastically exclamatory statement but yet is true. What will we mean by an ideal state? A state somebody wanted to be in over which he had full power of choice. See, that would be an ideal state. Well, of course, unless an individual's power of choice is adjustable and his control of his environment is considerable, he could therefore never reach it. Wouldn't matter what his fundamental basic condition was, if this other condition was out, why, it'd be terrible.

So it's all right to erase the thetan's whole time track so he can live in a palace and so forth, but if you leave untouched the idea that his ideal state is to exist as some sort of being who can just wreck the works, you know, this is his ideal state. He must be in some kind of a condition where he can wreck the works at any given moment. Why—no matter how you've adjusted his mest, you haven't touched on this one factor. And he will be unhappy.

So the attainment of happiness for a pc is a parallel road to attaining Clear. I know that sounds very, very odd, but if you recognize that we have two factors at work here, all will become very plain to you about a lot of things in life. It's the environment and situation and conditions of the individual as they exist, the for real conditions of the individual. That's one channel. That's one channel. And nobody can get away from that channel. That is the channel. Only trouble is your sociologist and other people trying to adjust that channel do not achieve at the same time any alteration in this other channel. And this other channel has remained unknown in this universe. It has merely been growled about, suspected and reviled and chewed at, but nobody has ever been able to do anything with it, because nobody's ever really made a fundamental statement concerning it.

And that is quite new to this universe. Although you could state all these things and everybody knows them, it happens that it's not a simple statement. It happens to be a complex statement. It's his affinity, reality and his communication with regard to the matter, energy, space, time and postulates of his conditions.

Now, you say, "Well, isn't this ARC? Aren't these things borne out of his postulates?" Not necessarily. These are borne out of an interplay between his postulates and the experiences netted. We're still on an interactive basis between postulates, you see, and conditions and experiences. We still have this other thing. This other nebulous thing, this power of choice. Only if you say power of choice, of course that makes a dictator very right. He says, "Well, I know what right is. It's what I say is right." See? This is the total logic back of the Napoleons and Hitlers of history. He knows what right is, he knows what's wrong. See, he didn't say it so it's wrong. Elementary, my dear Watson.

And so this whole subject has become perverted. In actual fact, it's the person's affinity, reality and communication with regard to a set of circumstances, existences or environments. So you've got this second channel you're walking up all the time. And it's not been hidden from us as Scientologists, but we, frankly, don't pay quite enough attention to it in processing.

But we needed some big, beefy process to match up—and you remember, your reality programing, your programing matters, also depended on the auditor, didn't it? There was one of those scales had the auditor as one of the factors in programing a ease. Well, we needed a process that somebody could just sit there and grind out. They could just do it by the hour, and something fantastic would happen with the case.

Now, it unfortunately is not an end—all. It's not an end—all. It won't go the whole line. It won't go the whole route. Well, why? Because it's not actually directly handling the conditions of the pc. It's handling the pc's attitudes toward those conditions, or his—his—pardon me, his attitudes, realities and communication powers with regard to those conditions is what it's handling. But it handles them enough so that it can cut away these lower levels of case—at levels 4 of some use, levels 5 very useful—that's the dub - in. Dub—in of dub - invaluable. And evaluation starting to get a bit questionable, but still of some use, and unconscious, of no use at all. A person who is totally unaware has no use for them at all. But he will have as soon as you bring him up to where he can consult his own evaluations. See, then there's—that minimal use sets in. And he can be moved on up.

Pretty weird that a case can be booted up by shifting that. But you're going to run into a point of no return on almost any ease sooner or later, if you don't eventually—I mean, you won't get him to OT because this is not powerful enough to kick up through the last two strata. It only kicks it through the lower strata. You could put up a case with this and some other little touches and polishings—up and so forth, you can put a case up to a point where he's got his time track and is running it. And you can't then use the process to finish off the whole case on up to OT because there's always that upper strata. And now we aren't so much worried about power of choice because the fellow believes now that his power of choice is alterable and that he can do something about it and about his conditions. No, you've got to put him into handling the actual stuff which has aberrated him. Sooner or later he's got to handle this stuff, see. But right up to that point you can put him into a situation where he can get close enough to it to handle it, don't you see? And that's the use of this particular process.

Now, just because I said it's a process can be ground out endlessly, don't get the idea that it's a process—don't go overboard and decide that it requires no skill to use it. Because you will be, any one of you will be setting up some auditor to run this, regardless of your own auditing of it, and setting up one or more auditors under you to run this. You're going to discover to your horror that they can dream up more wrong ways to do this than you could easily count up in a single morning. They can dream up more questions that don't mean anything and you'll have a hard time catching up with it. So there is a right way to do it. Fortunately that right way is easily stated.

Now, I told you about the ARC triangle has to be kept in balance. Well, that's about the first error they will make. I've already covered that. Preclear's having an awful time with the communication leg, therefore you should run it three sessions and run the other two, two sessions, you See. Ow! No, you've got to keep these legs in balance.

Next thing you're going to learn is although cases at level 3 on that programming scale are quite capable of running three questions, bop—bop—bop, bop—bop—bop, bop—bop—bop, see. Question one, question two, question three, you know. Three questions. Three types of question. Although they're quite capable of doing that, you actually produce more tone arm action if you do them one at a time. One, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, one, to a place where we can change, and then two, two, two, two, two, two, two, two, two, two, to a place where we can change, then three, three, three, three to a place where we can change.

Now, that's a happy thing, because it only runs that way on the lower cases. So there is no reason to preserve the one—two—three, one—two—three, one—two—three sequence, at all. There is no reason to run it that way at all. It can be run that way, but there's no reason to run it that way. Because the case that could run it that way—first place he doesn't need the process—runs better if you run it one, one, one, one, one, two, two, two, two, two, three, three, three, three, see? He runs better if you run it that way.

So the better way to run it is always one leg at a time until it is flat. What's flat? Already covered it. How long? Well, let me give you some kind of an idea of the mistakes you could use by laying down an arbitrary: We say, "Well, one hour for each leg." That's fine, divide it

up by time by all means, because that's the easiest way to divide it up. The easiest way to take it off an auditor's report. But you've got—you've got something standing in your road. The pc takes half an hour per answer on leg one and answers rapidly on the other two legs. All right, so somebody asks you for an adjudication. Well, run it equal numbers of questions. Run each one seventy—five questions. That seems like a pretty good idea.

Mark my words, somebody's going to defeat you on that one too. They'll find some way to defeat you on that particular thing. I'm an old hand at this. They will get the pc up to four just before the blowdown and leave the process, inevitably. Something like that, you see. The pc's just drawing a breath, just gets a misty look in his eye. Oh, he's about to cognite and that's the seventy—fifth question, don't you see? So you go back to one on the next one.

I'm afraid that you will develop far greater cynicism on this subject than I have. It's better to understand what you are trying to achieve. You're trying to achieve a similar amount of run for each one, of these legs and not favor the one that is hardest but handle it by getting the other two.

Now, I noticed on an auditor's report just a short time ago that somebody had made a mistake on this. Co—audit folders that are just done just a few minutes ago. Somebody had found out that reality was not producing much tone arm action and so had run a very short period of reality. Very, very short period of reality compared to the next period of communication which was producing tone arm action. And then gave it practically the rest of the session.

Now, that defeats the purpose of it. And you'll find the pc is going to get wildly out of balance. How often do you change the process? Well, that's how often. There is no answer, don't you see? How often do you shift a process? It's the same answer, how long does it take to flatten the process on each leg?. This is one you play by ear, man, it changes from pc to pc.

This pc—this pc grinds away just splendidly as long as you don't leave them more than about fifteen minutes on each leg. That pc just does fine.

And this other one, a real grind—type case, just doesn't do well that way at all. They're just beginning to find out what process it is at the end of fifteen minutes, so again, this idea of cognition monitored against an equivalency of time, you see.

Now, he's having lots of cognitions, but you know that you're going to run this on this particular pc, you know you're going to try to get through all three questions in the one session. That is your hope, see. So when you're coming up toward the end of the period you've allocated for that first one to be finished off, your ear just comes up like a rabbit's, you see, listening for that communication that is a cognition.

Pc says, "Well, I think I'm getting pretty well along with..."

"Oh, you are! Well, thank you very much, that was the last command of the process. It was jus—huh, huh, huh."

That's cutting it awfully thin, isn't it? But you'll find out your pc will be happy there.

Now, an arbitrary run exactly against the stopwatch will not find your pc happy. The pc does live, does think, is a living, breathing being.

All right, how many variations are there to the process? Well, I've given you clearing the command of the process, but you would just be fascinated at how many variations there could be of this process. The best stunt is to get the person to run the most fundamental that you can get them to run. Always try to get them to run the most fundamental statement of the question you can get them to run that they will run. Don't go out on the order of get the fanciest variation in the question that they can run, try to get the simplest thing. Try to argue them through. "Attitude" seems to communicate all right on the subject of affinity, see. "Affinity"

doesn't communicate, "attitude" seems to. See? That's fine, so you got "attitude" and they seem to respond all right to "rejected." So that's "What attitude has been rejected?" That's a good fundamental statement.

"Now, when or what haven't you really eared to love somebody?" That's about as fancy as you could get, see. Well, if you had to choose between those two, you would take "What attitude has been rejected?" See, and that would bring you through. Because the less you change the auditing command the happier your pc is going to be. And that's another rule.

Because when you change the auditing command too much you run into the old rule of too many processes. Each one is a slightly different process, therefore you never really get a chance to flatten any of the processes. So constant shifts of this process are very poor. So try to settle it down for the long run. Try to settle it down for the long run very early. And if you find the pc is making—is having difficulty trying to wrap his or her wits around one of the legs as a question, if you're going to change it, change it early. Change it soon. And then keep it. You want this one set up for the long haul. So therefore, get it changed early if you're going to change it at all. Preferably in the first session that it's run. Don't let it drift for four sessions and then change it.

It's better to run a wrong question pretty near, that has been run for a long time, than to change it then, don't you see? Pc eventually will get so he can live with it.

Now, there's—there are some of the rules of guidance on this process. And what's the next one?

The keynote of it is muzzled. It is always a muzzled process. Someone shouldn't be feeling that he is being treated as an amateur because he is told to run it muzzled. It's almost the same statement as—"Run the ARC break process" and "Run the process muzzled" are practically synonymous statements. Because you don't run it any other way. There is nothing to pick up, there is nothing to straighten out, there is nothing to do anything with or about once you've got it in the run. The auditor's sole concern is understanding and acknowledging what the pc has said. Sole concern.

The pc comes up with and says, "You know, I've got an incident here that's 8,765 trillion, billion, squillion years ago, and I'm lying here and so forth and so on," well, the answer to that is "Okay." Now, the only Variation comes on this is the pc going to blow his brains out when he asks you, or requests you to please date it; find out where he is. Now, there's where the question takes place. Do you refuse to date it and ARC break the pc, or date it and ARC break the pc by eventually messing up his ARC process? See?

Well, that's the little questions that you the auditor have to live with. There are so many of these questions—there's so many of these questions, that to attempt to give you a solution to every existing Condition which exists at that order of magnitude in the session is not only impossible, but it'd be idiotable.

Now, your situation, then, with this process is that it is a muzzled process, it is definitely a muzzled process, but sometimes if you don't talk with the pc, a pc will ARC break. But you start offering the pc any Auditor Code break type evaluations and invalidations and that sort of thing, and you'll wish to God you never had... The pc comes up with a still picture. This is one of the traps. Some auditors—still picture, pssww! The devil with the routine, see. We don't care what routine we're running.

Pc says, "I've got a picture here, and it's still." The auditor—bang! He's right in there, man, he can't stay out of it, for some reason or other. It acts just like a pole trap to him. I actually have seen some auditor—tried and tried to break them of this habit. Because of course you can't audit a still picture. Death and dynamite to touch one of the things. But for some reason or other they would.

Pc comes up and he's just answered this, and by God, he says, "You know, for the last half hour I've had this picture. And it's just a wide plain, and there's nothing happening at all." Well, of course your basic impulse is to help him out. Blow your brains out, man, if you open your yep and bust the routine then, because you're asking to plow him straight into the track on a light process. You see, you're not running engrams. And this process, if you really restimulated an engram, you know, by handling it, and then fell off back to this process again, you've had it. Because this process won't handle the engram that's been otherwise handled, see.

So you say, just to be agreeable, "Oh, a wide, still plain, now? All right, okay, yeah. Okay. All right, now here's the next question." But if the process didn't do something to move him on the track, I'd start to get suspicious as to what he was doing with the process. I wouldn't wrack him around, I'd bring him up to some halting point and then as though it's the most natural thing in the world I would put in the big mid ruds on the ARC process. It's very interesting that we can rehabilitate a process with the big mid ruds. We could actually precheck this process and get some interesting ways.

Now, this process does not mush an engram. It'll actually push an engram around, it'll open it up. It won't run it. But it'll shotgun engrams. It hits one part of a chain and another part of a chain and another part of a chain, and starts taking selective chunks out of various portions of the engram chain. This doesn't do any harm because it's only picking up those pieces of it that belong to other chains anyhow. Perfectly all right. Nothing disastrous can happen with this process, providing you don't think yourself too much.

Now, if you tried to run this process as a cyclic process until the pc is on present time—in present time on every leg, you have set yourself up a problem that I don't think anybody could ever solve anyhow. And what's this passion for getting the pc in present time? He hasn't been in present time for trillennia.

Probably the best way to handle this sort of a situation—you've been chewing away at it, and you've run him this and run him that and he wasn't in PT on this leg and he wasn't in PT on that leg and he doesn't get into PT on another leg and the three legs are parked at different portions of the track. This sounds very complicated, but it isn't going to hurt him any. And you decide that the best thing you could possibly do is get him to present time and make him a little more comfortable. Why, you get him to present time. But, how do you do that? You just tell him to move to the date of the session. Month, date and year. Or "Move to June 12th, 1963. Thank you." You don't say, "Are you there? Did you move? Did the somatic strip work? Well, what do you know? I didn't think it would." That's not done.

That's the best way to say, "Come to present time" these days, by the way. You can move him to present time at the end of the session, it doesn't matter.

Now, the next time you pick it up you're going to find him parked exactly where you left him on each leg anyhow, so who cares? Theoretically, he would only get to present time on this process when the process was flat. Well, when is this process flat? When it's flat. Actually, now your meter means something. The process is flat when, all rudiments being in on the process, the process run produces no tone arm departure from the Clear read of the pc. That's how flat. That's on any leg. That process is flat. No tone arm departure—mid ruds being in on the process, the tone arm does not depart from Clear read on any one of its legs. Now, when I said "does not depart," I meant "does not depart." It doesn't go to 3.5 to 3.0, that's all over.

Now, the one other thing that you probably have to know about this—that is actually as far as you can state "when is the process flat," and "when is the—should the pc be in present time?" Well, the pc should have the process flat and be in present time at that point. You actually are not really trying to achieve this by running the ARC process. You're trying to get some part of this achieved. You're trying to get the best part of it achieved that you can. You're trying

to do the most you can with the ARC process in the time of auditing which you have. And all that's—that's—you've gone as far as you could go.

But remember, that because the tone arm isn't operating early in running the process is no signal that the process is flat. Because tone arm action on a pc, particularly who can't be run on any other process, and particularly a pc who has to be carefully grooved in and they're very particular about this meaning and that meaning, oh, watch it man. Because that pc's going to start in, maybe the pc's chronic tone arm position might be 3.0. See?

And you grind away on leg one and that takes you, well, I don't know, half a session to get it anyplace, still sitting there at 3.0. Your next leg, still sitting here at 3.0. Your next leg, moves to 3.0... You can see sometimes auditors in desperation start to decimalize tone arm reads, you see, out to the third or fourth place, you know? 3.147, you know? It looks good, you know? 3.147. And then it moved back. Then you go another couple of sessions on the thing, and you'll find it's going to 3.5 and back.

A few sessions later this pc will be winding the thing all the way around the dial. Now, the greatest tone arm action I've seen is produced by engram running on a case that can run engrams. That's the greatest tone arm action. But don't think this ARC process won't produce tone arm action. But that action has to be run in to the process and then out of it, on cases that really have to have it.

Oh, it's sticky, you know, it runs up here at 4.25. All you have to do is get to reality and it goes to 4.25. Or get to communication it goes to—the other two are running flat, see, no action to amount to anything. The second you get to this one of the legs, maybe it's affinity, you see, it will be one of the legs, all of a sudden, bzzzzzz! And there it stays, for that third of a session you're going to run this, see. There it goes, there it is. And it varies around it, it goes from 4.28 to 4.193. That's the Variation of it, see.

And the second you get back on in the next leg, boup! It'll be running from 2.78 to 2.79. You'll watch them. And that will be one of the phenomena, one of the manifestations you'll see on your auditor's report. And, one leg is making it going up and stick it. Well, then a second leg all of a sudden will start sticking it. Then that—starts to look like this case is getting in lots of trouble. This is the time an auditor who doesn't—hasn't been through the jumps on this starts sweating. "One made it go up and stick, one leg, you see, now two of the legs make it go up and stick; I hope the third one won't take off, see." And you realize unless you've got all three of them up and stuck, it doesn't free to an ARC. And all of a sudden the third one goes up and sticks, and the one that was up originally goes to 6.

Well, your main questions are, is the pc answering the auditing command? That's your main—your main worry. Now, does he understand the auditing command? And that has to all be done very early on, and after that, can we keep it smoothly enough balanced up that we can get him plowed through and bring him out the other end?

Now, all of those questions are in that order of importance. Is he answering the auditing command? Now, it doesn't do to hound the pc too much, but you can add a rudiment that takes care of this; it's the old rudiment, but specialize it, "Has any command been not answered?" you see. "In this session have you failed to answer any question or command?" you know? And you should think that is pretty good—pretty good thing to throw in there. So you want to make sure that he stays clean on those answers. Because if he starts omitting answering auditing commands he'll wreck the process. And that's the only thing that can wreck the process.

He starts lying to you about having answered it. And he starts hedging, he starts squirming off on you and that sort of thing. Well, there's something has gone wrong here that you'll have to put right early, and is frankly about all the trouble you have with the process. And you see, that's fairly rare. But if you do have any real trouble with a process, the pc isn't answering the auditing command.

The other phenomena which show up are just meaningless. They're just the phenomena of processing. If you don't expect change on the TA, what you processing him for? See? TA will do all kinds of wild things. You can take these low tone arm cases, and this will crack a low tone arm case up. And it'll also back the low tone arm case clear through 7.0. This process will do some remarkable things.

The process itself should be run however, very nicely, very neatly, in good balance and so forth. About the only other thing I can tell you about this ARC process that might prove valuable to you, is that it can be prefixed by any combination of words. Prefixed by anything. You can say, "In marriage," "In auditing," "On your job." Some person—you're running "In auditing" and all of a sudden you find out this person's been a D of P and that sort of thing a lot, and they had a lot to do with eases and so forth. Or an Instructor, and it's not "In auditing," it's "On auditing." Your Variation of your statement, don't you see, then brings this out to tremendous, broad usages. And it is much more powerful than a Problems Intensive ever dreamed of being, when used selectively that way.

Now, to do it that way, you don't necessarily have to do an assessment, but you could do an assessment of the various sections of a person's life if you wanted to use this very finitely on a sort of an assist basis. What's he do? He has a job and he has this and he does that and so forth and we finally get it narrowed down to what really worries him. We kind of do an analysis on the case, you see. And we say, what really worries this bird is transportation. Really worries him, see. Look at it fall here. We tell him—we ask him, "What's you—what's your life consist of?"

And he says, "Oh, driving to work, and eating, and well, there's being married, and there's my children, and there's—and well, my job, and there's this and there's that..." And we assess this long list, see. Driving to work. Psssw! Well, let's make a statement of this driving to work that we can use. And probably the statement that embraces it is "On transportation," something like that. But that statement has to read, see, transportation has to read as well as "driving to work" or we don't use it, see.

Now, we could cut into this thing and we'd say, "On transportation" and each question is preceded by that. You can cut yourself right straight back right into the Helatrobus Implants or something like that, this guy's hair would be standing on end in no time. But you'd get away with it. There's the general permissive use of it is what you will have most use for. The greatest uses of this thing will be "In auditing," and just the general question, "What—?"

Now, let me call to your attention the fact that the Helatrobus Implants do contain words such as "remember," and therefore you do very well to avoid those in your auditing commands. Just like you wouldn't ask anybody, "Have you ever absolutely gotten drunk?" See, you just wouldn't use an auditing command that repeated this confounded word, see, because you know you'll practically spin in the pc after a while.

So, you don't even bring anything that's close to that goal "to remember" which is present on every case, which is "recall" or something. Now, there's probably goals about "think" and so forth, because I've run into tremendous numbers of pcs who didn't dare think. "Think" is the great antipathy over here in the UK on putting processes together. You say, "Think of a or something, you have to change it to "Get the idea of..." Well, it's odd that you'd change it, so there must be some type of implant sitting around that has the word "think" in it. Otherwise pcs would be able to answer this auditing command. So keep that type of word out of these ARC break—Straightwire. See, just keep that type of word out.

You say, "Recall something you have gone out of affinity with." No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no... Let's always make a simpler statement out of it. "What have you gone out of affinity with," see? See, omit those words that refer to the mind and think and so forth from your auditing commands and you'll be away.

Now, this process, as simple as it is, in your hands, actually delivers the rougher cases that you have been worrying about. Because they're always very happy to run it. They don't have to know anything. They don't have to have any evaluations. You don't have to do anything with the case. The case will just sit there and run it. They'll be quite happy to run it.

Now, with little children, and that sort of thing, you've really got to bend these questions around the corner. They've got to get awful simple. In fact, they've got to get so simple that they're liable to become meaningless. You know, you can't quite make them simple enough so the kid can get them and so forth. But this all comes under the heading of clearing questions, and you just remember that you've got to clear the question much more carefully with a child if you're going to run this type of process.

And when you start a ease running on this sort of thing give him enough of a run on it so he gets some benefit out of it and he will be very happy about it.

Now, there are those cases which cannot recall, cannot remember, cannot do this, cannot do that, to whom the track is totally blocked off. Recognize that you are dealing with a 7 or 8 level case. And what they need is reach and withdraw on the awareness—the unaware case. And on evaluation they undoubtedly will need some CCHs. Because it just won't bite. Won't bite. Well, there's just nothing there to bite. See?

Now, you can use, however, the same principles of this on discussing whether they want to be here or not. You get the idea? Discussing whether or not they like you, or not. Discussing whether or not they wish to talk to you or not. You're running a present time version of it, aren't you? So don't avoid the fact that you can make a discussing two—way comm out of these processes right in present time without asking the ease to recall at all. And that might prove to you a valuable weapon at one time or another. You can talk about present time and you're not asking the person to remember or to think or to go backtrack, and they very often will gradually and gracefully curve into being able to go backtrack, see. Case has tremendous value for altering case state. State of ease alters very rapidly with this.

All right, well, I didn't want to beat the process to death, but I did want to give you a good review of the process because you will be using it and because it's a very valuable process. There'll be bulletins out on this subject but I doubt they will contain much more than what I've given you in this lecture.

Thank you very much.