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VERY IMPORTANT

E-METER READS

PREPCHECKING

HOW METERS GET INVALIDATED

Due to the fantastic number of instant needle reactions missed by poorly trained auditors, it would be well to check this question out on any preclear who has been previously audited:

“Has any auditor ever failed to find a meter read on you that you thought should have reacted?”

Or any version thereof.

“As an auditor have you ever deliberately ignored a significant meter response?”

Or any version thereof.

“Have you ever invalidated an E-Meter?”

Or any version thereof.

“As a preclear have you ever successfully persuaded an auditor the meter was wrong?”

Or any version thereof.

“Have you ever attempted to invalidate a meter read in order to keep something secret?”

Or any version thereof.

Pcs who have routinely had meter reads missed on them become so unconfident of the meter that they are perpetually ARC broke. Only ARC breaks stop a meter from reacting. Therefore this unconfidence in the meter can cancel meter reads!

It is utterly fatal to pass up an instant reaction on a pc. It invalidates the meter and may cancel further reads.

Meters work. They work every time. Only auditors fail by failure to use the meter reactions to guide a session. Only the auditing question or the auditor’s inability to read can be wrong.
Because of bad metering many pcs get the secret opinion that meters do not in fact work. This is caused by sloppy auditors who miss instant reads and fail to clean up hot questions.

If the pc knows it is hot and the auditor fails to see the meter react, the pc thinks he can “beat the meter” and is thereafter harder to audit because of this specific phenomenon.

This is exactly how meters get invalidated – auditors who fail to read them and meters that aren’t Mark IVs. There have been plenty of both in the past, so clean up the above question. It’s all that keeps some pcs from winning.

And, oh yes, don’t miss meter reads! And, oh very yes, be sure you are well trained on meters!

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.cden
TV DEMO: FISH & FUMBLE
CHECKING DIRTY NEEDLES

An auditing demonstration given on 23 May 1962

LRH: We are going to give you a proper session, and we're going to do some fish and fumble there.

PC:  Okay.

LRH: I told you just a moment ago, we're going to look for this tick-tick, and we're going to see if we can find this tick-tick, and find out what it was, because that had me mighty curious when I had you on the line.

PC:  That was the one on – on that Prepcheck chain I went down.

LRH: Yeah.

PC:  Hm.

LRH: That's right. That was an interesting thing I actually did narrow it down to just that, and – since then.

PC:  Hm.

LRH: So we'll see if it's still there.

PC:  Great.

LRH: Okay. Is it all right with you if I begin this session now?

PC:  Yeah.

LRH: Good. Start of session. Has the session started for you?

PC:  Yeah. Not really.

LRH: All right. All right. Here it is.

PC:  Yeah.

LRH: Start of session.

PC:  Okay.

LRH: Okay. What goals would you like to set for this session?

PC:  To be able to get to sleep easier at night. I've been having trouble getting to sleep.

LRH: All right.

PC:  The last few nights. And to ...

LRH: Good.

PC:  ... to stay in present time when I'm studying. When I sort of run out of – get out of present time, find myself reading over a paragraph of a bulletin or something like that without reading it.

LRH: Okay. All right. Any other goals?

PC:  That ought to do it.

LRH: All right. Got an ARC break there? All right, thank you. Any goals you'd like to set for life or livingness?

PC:  I'd like to – well, I have a goal: it's – it's – it's an imp – almost im-
possible goal, but maybe it's possible, you know?

LRH: Yeah?

PC: To get Class II by the end of the month, or by the end of this period. But, you know, it's getting pretty close there.

LRH: All right. Anything else?

PC: I'd like to be auditing next week. Start auditing.

LRH: All right.

PC: Champing at the bit. I want to – like those – a little like those commandos who want to, you know, get out.

LRH: [laughs] All right. Okay, Fred. Now, look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. All right. Now, let's see. What process was working on you? It was Touch, wasn't it?

LRH: All right. Squeeze the cans. Thank you. Put the cans down. All right. We're going to run a little bit of Touch here. All right. Touch that table. Thank you. Touch that wood. Thank you. Touch that ashtray. Thank you. Touch that chair. Thank you. Touch those cans. Good. Give them a squeeze. Squeeze 'em. All right. Squeeze 'em. Hey, that's a difference! All right, thank you. All right. That's it. Now – check this on the meter. Look around here and tell me if it's all right to audit in this room. Thank you. Relatively clean.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Just a little slowdown; doesn't amount to a hill of beans. Feel better?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Hey, what do you know? That was fast enough, wasn't it? All right. Are you willing to talk to me about your difficulties? Thank you. That's clean. Since the last time I audited you ...

PC: [laughs] A lot of water's gone under the bridge.

LRH: Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? I have an action there.


LRH: Okay.

PC: I – I thought that was pretty clean. Anyway, when I – I left the – I left that post, I – I wrote a whole series of notes ...

LRH: Yeah.

PC: ... explaining the job to ever – whoever. I – I addressed them to Franchise Secretary from Fred.

LRH: Hm.

PC: Whole series of notes explaining the job, explaining various aspects, vary – you know, the various things I was working on. And I – I wasn't exactly sure Robin was going to come on the post, but I was pretty sure. And – but I thought it would be kind of funny if I – you know, it would be interesting, if I ...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... wrote these notes and told Robin how to do the job. But anyway, it was kind of an overt on Robin.

LRH: Okay.

PC: It was.

LRH: All right. Let me check that on the meter.
PC: Yeah.

LRH: Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything you are withholding? Got a little tick there.

PC: Well, it's uh – I uh ...

LRH: That's it.

PC: ... this friend of mine – it's about this – this ... Remember about – suspicions about that key and about ...

LRH: Yeah.

PC: ... this friend? This is about that key. I – I never got in touch with him. I wrote him a letter ...

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: ... saying, "Oh, you know, gee, I haven't seen you, and give me a call." I got the letter back – no – n-n-not at – not at that address.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know? And I was, you know, wondering what – what happened. Something's – something's wrong there, you see?

LRH: Hm-mm.

PC: I have to check in ...

LRH: Hm.

PC: ... because, (a) he wouldn't move without letting me know his new address.

LRH: Hm.

PC: Um – (b) I might have wrote it to the wrong address ...

LRH: Hm.

PC: ... but I – I – I don't think so.

LRH: Mm-mm.

PC: And something wrong there. I have to look into that.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Let me check this on the meter.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? Little tick, much smaller.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: That's it.

PC: I had a party at my place, and some girls over, and kind of a wild party.

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: I told you about that, I think...

LRH: Yeah.

PC: ... probably the group, you know ...

LRH: Okay.

PC: ... but not about that party.

LRH: All right. Let me check that on the meter. Since the last time I audited you, have you done anything that you are withholding? That's cleaner than a wolf's tooth. Very good?

PC: Yep.

LRH: All right. Do you have a present time problem? Thank you. That's clean. Okay. Now, I told you about fishing around here.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And we're going to do some fish and fumble ...

PC: Hm-hm.
LRH: ... see where we wind up here. And mysteriously, I have no tick-tick.

PC: [laughs] Well...

LRH: Obviously, you're ... What were you going to say?

PC: I don't know. It was on that chain, and it was on that past life, or connected up with it.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: Maybe if I found that again and I could -- I don't know if it was that or something else, or what.

LRH: Well, that, you know ...

PC: It was something -- it was something about messing with little girls ...

LRH: Yeah?

PC: ... You know?

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Something -- messing with little girls ...

LRH: There it is. There it is. There it is.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Ha-ha, ha-ha!

PC: Uhh.

LRH: All right. Well, we didn't have to fish very long there, did we?

PC: No.

LRH: Something about messing with little girls.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: And just like that, we get it back. All right, let me check it now.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay? What about messing with little girls? Well, that isn't quite the tick-tick.

PC: No.

LRH: Now, let me see if we can get it just a little closer than that. There it is. What did you just think of?

PC: Dang! I -- I just look -- kind of looked at a little something there, and kind of looked away. I can't -- you know, sort of a hunk of something, you know?

LRH: Yeah, yeah, yeah, yeah.

PC: One of those gray hunks of something ...

LRH: That's right.

PC: ... that don't have any definite ...

LRH: There it is again.

PC: [laughs] I -- it looks like a -- a rocket ship nose, or something, or -- or a bomb nose, or something like this. I don't know.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Is that it, or ...

LRH: Yeah.

PC: ... or not? I ...

LRH: Well, let me check this over again. What about messing with little girls? Ahh, there -- there's a tiny little slowdown there.

PC: I looked at that thing again, when you mentioned it.

LRH: Something here about messing with little girls in the nose of a rocket ship?
PC:  I – that's what the – I looked at that, and there was something connected there or someplace; I don't know why.

LRH:  Yeah.

PC:  But, you see, it ...

LRH:  Yeah.

PC:  It's a – it's kind of a, you know, what's happening here? You know? How come – how come this connects up like this or something like that, you know?

LRH:  All right. Well, I'll find it.

PC:  Yeah.

LRH:  I'll find it. Now – there it is! Who are you looking at?

PC:  Well, it – that was th-th-those two little girls that we talked about in that Prepccking session that I ...

LRH:  That's it.

PC:  ... those two twins.

LRH:  Uh-huh.

PC:  They were either twins or – or sisters that I messed with ...

LRH:  Uh-uh.

PC:  ... in – back in early – early days in my life.

LRH:  That's it.

PC:  I was ten years old, or so. And so ...

LRH:  And we were going down that chain.

PC:  Yeah. Yeah. We kind of went past them, and ...

LRH:  All right. Let me see if I can get a What question that's right into the middle there.

PC:  Hm.

LRH:  What about sexually interfering with little girls? That's it.

PC:  Is it?

LRH:  I get a tinier, smaller read.

PC:  Yeah.

LRH:  I might be able to vary that just a little bit. There it is. What's that?

PC:  That's a picture of sexually interfering with a little girl.

LRH:  Yeah.

PC:  I don't think it's this lifetime. I mean, I don't know ...

LRH:  Well, that doesn't matter.

PC:  Yeah. That's that sex pervert or ...

LRH:  Hm-hm.

PC:  ... probably a sex-pervert thing. But that's tied up with that other – that – that ... Well, it – I – I think it's the same little girl as in that other picture I've had so many years, I looked at.

LRH:  What was that? The ...

PC:  The one of having a little girl with her panties down, and with a – switching her.

LRH:  Hm.

PC:  And seeing – this picture is seeing an – an older man do this. Watching it from the bushes, something like this ...

LRH:  Hm-hm.

PC:  ... in – in the yard of this ...

LRH:  Right.

PC:  ... place with ...

LRH:  Right.

PC:  ... a stream going by or
something like that.

**LRH:** Right.

**PC:** I've had that picture so long, you know?

**LRH:** Hm-hm.

**PC:** And this – I'm not sure if it's the same girl or not.

**LRH:** All right. Now, hold your cans still there and let me check it.

**PC:** Yeah.

**LRH:** Let me check another little What here.

**PC:** Hm.

**LRH:** What about punishing little girls? Clean.

**PC:** Hm.

**LRH:** What about sexually interfering with little girls? It's not giving me the same read as the double tick.

**PC:** Yeah.

**LRH:** There – what's that? 

**PC:** Switching little girls.

**LRH:** What about switching little girls? That isn't it.

**PC:** Eating little girls?

**LRH:** Beating little girls?

**PC:** Beating or eating?

**LRH:** Eating?

**PC:** Eating little girls.

**LRH:** All right. What about eating little girls? Well, I get a something of a reaction there. What about eating little girls? It cleaned.

**PC:** Hm.

**LRH:** All right. Let me try another What question here. What about stealing little girls? I get an action here.

**PC:** Hm-hm.

**LRH:** You see, the reason I'm putting that together isn't a shot in the dark. You were talking about taking over a body before this lifetime.

**PC:** Yeah.

**LRH:** See, and I was ...

**PC:** Yeah.

**LRH:** ... getting a reaction on that. Now, what about taking over little girls? I don't get the same reaction.

**PC:** Hm-hm.

**LRH:** What about stealing little girls? I get an instant read on that. What about stealing little girls? It's not the same instant read I'm fishing for, however.

**PC:** Hm-hm.

**LRH:** There it is. There it is. It was just for a minute and we went by it.

**PC:** Boy, that's awfully fast, you know? It's – it's ... Boy, it's something that's really occluded.

**LRH:** Yeah, yeah, yeah.

**PC:** Ha! No – all around it, but I can't ...

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** ... can't get to it.

**LRH:** All right.

**PC:** But I keep popping – keep thinking about – on the same line, I don't know if it's just jazz chat or what. But some incident I ran – some past life incident, way back.

**LRH:** Hm-mm.
PC: Spaceship — just wound up taking over the ... Supposed to burn off this planet and save one city and rape the city, or something like that.

LRH: What's this now? Take a ...

PC: \( I - I - I. \)

LRH: ... a burner ...

PC: Yeah, to burn off the whole planet.

LRH: Oh, you burnt off a whole — I got it.

PC: Yeah, I was supposed to blow — burn the whole thing off, but I saved one city, and I raped the city before I burned it off.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: And part of that was it — at least as I came up in — I don't know, it — hell, it picked them — I mean, it's just not ...

LRH: Well, now there — there's the double tick.

PC: Yeah? It's — I take — took all the — asked all the five-year-old girls in the — all the five-year-old blond little girls in the town into the palace, and raped them all.

LRH: Hm-hm. We're getting the tick-tick.

PC: Yeah. Huh!

LRH: We did.

PC: And then — did that and my — I ordered my men, or my men and I raped — raped all these little girls ...

LRH: Mm-m. There's your tick-tick.

PC: ... five-year-old girls. And then afterward, we burned the city off.

LRH: All right. Let's see if I can make up a What here.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What about raping a city? All right. What about raping little girls? What about raping little girls? No. What about that auditing session? What about that auditing session that you ran that in? That's it. There's a latent on that.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: All right. What auditor was that?

PC: Think it was Stan.

LRH: Who?

PC: Stan Stromfeld.

LRH: Yeah?

PC: Think it was him. Must have been him.

LRH: Was it? I don't get a reaction here.

PC: No?

LRH: Was it Stan Stromfeld that ran that? I don't get any reaction on that.

PC: I'll be darned.

LRH: Somebody earlier than that?

PC: Janine? No. Unless it was New York. Oh, maybe it was Doris. Marge? Damn. I don — I can't remember ...

LRH: All right. Let's put it together here.

PC: ... who it was. Raping — past lives and ...

LRH: There — you got the — there's the ghost of a tick.

PC: Denise?
LRH: Yeah. There it is. Microscopically smaller.

PC: Yeah, I know it. You ... Something there.

LRH: I just want to know what auditor it was.

PC: ... I'm not sure. You know? I mean, I – I – I don't really get anything.

LRH: All right. Well, let me help you out, may I?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Was it a girl auditor? Was it a male auditor? Male auditor.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Did it happen in the United States? Did it happen in Paris? All right, did it happen in Paris? Now I've got a double tick.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What are you thinking about? Happening in Paris?

PC: Vincent? Mario? Maybe it was Jack Campbell.

LRH: All right. Was it Jack Campbell?

PC: Maybe it was.

LRH: All right. Was that auditor Jack Campbell?

PC: Yeah, I guess it was.

LRH: There's something here about it now.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: I'm gettin ...

PC: Yeah, I guess it was. 'Cause he – he – he – he ran me on RT-3, think it was – OT-3.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: And it kind of went way back ...

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: ... into a lot of stuff ...

LRH: Now we're getting a double tick here.

PC: ... past life stuff. Yeah. There was that.

LRH: All right. You remember this now?

PC: Yeah, yeah.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay. And, now, did Jack Campbell miss a withhold on you?

PC: Undoubtedly! [laughs] No doubt.

LRH: All right.

PC: Yeah, I think he did.

LRH: All right. All right. Okay. Let me check that on the meter. Did Jack Campbell miss a withhold on you? I get a reaction.

PC: Yeah. [laughs]

LRH: All right. Now ...

PC: It – it's like saying, did Jack Campbell ever audit you? You know, I mean, it's like the same question. In fast, it was – it was funny.

LRH: Now, we're taking off from that as a Zero question.

PC: All right. Ooh.

LRH: All right.
PC: There must be something there? Line charge? Or something. [chuckles]

LRH: Okay. Now let me check out a possible One.

PC: All right.

LRH: Okay. What did you successfully hide from Jack Campbell? All right, let me check that. Now let me check another one. What have you done to Jack Campbell? Well, we're going to take that first.

PC: Yeah, it would be a good idea, I think.

LRH: Rightly or wrongly, we will take that first, because it'll flatten rather rapidly.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. We will test that now. We know that you have withheld from him.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: All right. Would that be doing something to him?

PC: The action of withholding from him?

LRH: Yeah, we actually are wrong here in phrasing this What question ...

PC: Yeah.

LRH: ... but I'm just testing this thing. Is there a specific overt?

PC: Uh...

LRH: I get a tick.

PC: Yeah. It – it's a kind of a – a specific overt, many times, in a sense, you know?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Well, the first overt, really, is that I considered that kind of – something was not quite right, or I didn't quite ... Well, when I first took the Communication Course in Paris, this ...

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: ... You know, in Scientology – the Scientology Communication Course – you take the Communication Course.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I – I didn't have the money for the course, and I told him that – oh, I was – I knew he liked me.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: All right, I knew he and Gernie liked me, I knew they were interested in me, they liked my work in the theater, blah-blah-blah.

LRH: Hm.

PC: And so I said, "Well, I – I – well, I – I'm – gee, I'd like to take this course, Jack, but I – you know, I can't pay for it. Don't have the money."

LRH: Hm.

PC: Like that. Now, I might have been able to scrape the money up if I had really – you know. You know, if he'd said, "Well, no, you go after the money and come and take the course."

LRH: All right.

PC: But he said – I don't have the money. I – I can't take this ..." and he said, "All right. It's all right," he said, "We – we want you to get the course. You can pay me later." I said, "Fine."

LRH: Well, tell me this now. Good. Tell me this now: Was that – the question we're on is doing something to him. Now, what specifically did you do to
PC: I kind of conned him into – I conned him into giving me the course for nothing. You know?

LRH: All right. Good. You conned him into it.

PC: Yeah. After – yeah ...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... after a fashion.

LRH: That's it. All right. Now, what about conning Jack Campbell?

PC: Yeah, that's a good What question.

LRH: All right.


LRH: Good. Well, that's the one we are going to work.

PC: Yeah, it makes me sweat a little bit.

LRH: All right. Very good. When was that?

PC: Summer of 1958.

LRH: Very good. Is that all there is to it?

PC: Oh, I thought, well, if – you know, what do I have to lose here, you know? Nothing – nothing in this course, and, well, figured on paying him later on.

LRH: All right. Good enough. All right. And what might have appeared there?

PC: Well, I could have shake – shaken some money up from someplace, I think ...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... to pay for it.
LRH: All right.
PC: Kind of a little bit of an overt against them. Very funny.
LRH: What?
PC: Just getting more debts without paying them off.
LRH: I see.
PC: You know, something like that.
LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Now, let's test this What question.
PC: Hm.
LRH: What about conning Jack Campbell? Have to test it again: What about conning Jack Campbell? That seems to have a tiny little bit of reaction on it. Let me ask you this. Is there any earlier moment there? Is there anything earlier, before that Comm Course? What's that?
PC: Yeah, had coffee or something with Jack and Gernie...
LRH: Yeah?
PC: ... and – I – Jack paid for the coffee or the drink or something – earlier, when I first met him. And I kind of conned him there a little bit. You know, he paid for the drink.
LRH: All right. Well, when was that?
PC: Was after a – hm. It – it was – well, it must have been after a – it must have been that spring, along in March or something like that.
LRH: Get a tick-tick.
PC: Yeah. In March ...
LRH: Yeah. All right. Good enough.
PC: ... that year. Yeah.
LRH: All right. What else is there to that?
PC: I just – that was the first time I saw him. That night.
LRH: That's the first time you ever saw him?
PC: Yeah.
PC: Yeah. Gernie invited me for a drink after an American Embassy Little Theatre group ...
LRH: Hm-hm.
PC: ... production.
LRH: All right.
PC: I'm not sure if it was hers or somebody else's. And – with her and Jack, and I saw this character first appear.
LRH: All right. Okay. And what might have appeared there?
PC: Hm. Well, I don't know. A couple of hundred francs from my pocket, I guess, to pay for the drinks, could have appeared.
LRH: All right. All right.
PC: I think I was broke, or something, and I had to con him. You know, I couldn't pay the drink. I don't think I had any money on me, or something like this. It was funny.
LRH: All right. Very good. who didn't find out about it?
PC: Well Jack and – Jack and Gernie didn't.
LRH: All right. Very good. Very good. All right. Let me test this What question again: What about conning Jack
Campbell? Still got an action. Did you meet him any earlier than that?

PC: Not that I know of.

LRH: Ah-ah-ah.

PC: Yeah?

LRH: You meet Jack Campbell earlier than that?

PC: Man, I don't remember if I do.

LRH: Come on, come on, come on. Did you meet him earlier than that? I got a reaction here.

PC: No.

LRH: Let me test this very carefully, before I send you off on a wild-goose chase.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than that? You've got a reaction here, man.

PC: I'll be darned. Jack Campbell earlier.

LRH: Yes, Jack Campbell earlier.

PC: I knew Gernie before I knew Jack.

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: The first I remember Gernie is meeting her after one of my productions there.

LRH: All right.

PC: And, I heard about Jack. Damn! Or something, and I was kind of curious about him.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And...
LRH: Ah!

PC: And maybe that's conning Jack a little bit, by getting Gernie interested.

LRH: All right.

PC: Inadvertently conning Jack – conning Gernie into – into getting her to back my theater project.

LRH: All right.

PC: Because I heard she was important, you know ...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... she had connections ...

LRH: Now we got little tick-tick. Yeah.

PC: ... and money, and – yeah – money and connections, and ...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... may – maybe it's kind of overt against Jack, and conning him, too, or something.

LRH: Well, you don't have to add it up to him. Were you trying ...

PC: Yeah.

LRH: ... to con Gernie?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Hm?

PC: Yeah, yeah.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Now is there a missed withhold right there at that meeting?

PC: First meeting with Jack? Yeah.

LRH: No. With Gernie.

PC: Gernie.

LRH: There a missed withhold there with Gernie? What would it be? What didn't she find out about?

PC: On me? Gee, I don't know. That – well, the first I – when I first met her, I – I didn't – here was this big, fat woman here, you know?

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: Yeah. And – but – had a lot of – pretty alive, you know? Gernie is pretty alive.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: She – and she was interested in – in – in me because she had seen the production and liked it. And I didn't know who she was.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: She – very nice talking, and gets – I got some admiration there, and stuff like this ...

LRH: Hm.

PC: ... You know, it was nice.

LRH: Well, have you answered the auditing question there? Is there a missed withhold from Gernie? I haven't got a reaction on it.

PC: No, I – I – I can't think of any.

LRH: All right. Now, let me test this What question again, huh?

PC: Hm.

LRH: All right. What about conning Jack? Now, we've still got a little tick here.

PC: Yeah.
LRH: All right. Did you meet Jack Campbell – coming back to one we had before ...

PC: Yeah.

LRH: ... did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this? All right. Let me ask you once more. Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this? I'm not getting a reaction on that.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: I'll – I'll say it once more, because you're getting dives here.

PC: Hm.

LRH: Did you meet Jack Campbell earlier than this? No, that's clean.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Now, is there a meeting between that first meeting with Gernie and what you were saying was the first meeting with Jack ...

PC: The meeting with Gernie? Between that time?

LRH: Yeah, well, is that – is ... Yeah, yeah. Is there a second meeting with Gernie before you met Jack?

PC: Gee, I sure got it occluded if there is. There must – I ...

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: ... yeah, there must have been. There must have been.

LRH: Uh-huh. We got a ...

PC: Must have been.

LRH: The double action is on there.

PC: Yeah. Funny, I've a little charge, too.

LRH: What goes on here?

PC: Gee. I'm just trying to think of what it was.

LRH: All right. Good. Good.

PC: Yeah. You know, it must have been, because by the time I met Jack, Gernie and I were already good friends, you know, there ...

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: Wonder what happened in there.

LRH: Yeah. All right. When might that have been?

PC: March? Well, yes. I first met her, right ... God, 58. What was that, Streetcar Named Desire?

LRH: Hm?

PC: Yeah. Streetcar Named Desire. I first met her then, when – when she was – it must have been after Street – no, it must have been sooner than Streetcar. Man, I've got so much confusion through this period, you know?

LRH: Interesting.

PC: It's interesting.

LRH: All right.

PC: Uh...

LRH: Okay. Well, how can I help you out there?

PC: Well, I – I – I'm not sure what you – what to look for now. I kind of got lost off of that ...

LRH: All right. Now, I asked you if there was a meeting ...

PC: Yeah.
LRH: ... with Gernie, before you – from that – between that first meeting ...
PC:  Yeah.

LRH: ... and when you met Jack. I was asking you ...
PC:  Yeah, there must have been several of them.

LRH: ... when was that period?
PC:  Yeah. I can't remember when I first met Gernie.

LRH: That's it.
PC:  Do you follow?

LRH: That's it. We haven't got the first meeting spotted, have we?
PC:  Yeah.

LRH: All right. Well, when might it have been?
PC:  I – it seems to me it was after Waiting for Godot. I – I – after I did that production. And that was in – sp – well, spring of 57. Yeah.

LRH: We're getting a bit of reaction there.
PC:  Yeah.

LRH: All right. Well, when might it have been?
PC:  I was – I was getting support from other people, too. Confused. I was, you know, very confused there.

LRH: Well?
PC:  I was – I was getting support from other people, too. Confused. I was, you know, very confused there.

LRH: Well, all right. Now we're getting onto something interesting. While they were supporting you, were you looking for support from other people?
PC:  Yeah, for my – well, not really. But I felt kind of guilty about – people would off – or something. You know, I'd – I'd get admiration and stuff like this. I was becoming an independent figure, you see?

LRH: All right. Okay. Did you particularly want him to appear on that scene?

PC:  No, I didn't even know about him existing, you see, at that – at that point, really.

LRH: Oh, you didn't know he existed at all?
PC:  No.

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. And who didn't find out about that first meeting? I got a reaction.

PC:  Oh, the – yeah, the – the people that ran the American Students and Artists Center didn't find out about that.

LRH: Oh, yeah. All right. Very good.

PC:  'Cause they were supporting me, they were behind me, and it was kind of – I don't know.

LRH: Well?

PC:  I was – I was getting support from other people, too. Confused. I was, you know, very confused there.

LRH: Well, all right. Now we're getting onto something interesting. While they were supporting you, were you looking for support from other people?

PC:  Yeah, for my – well, not really. But I felt kind of guilty about – people would off – or something. You know, I'd – I'd get admiration and stuff like this. I was becoming an independent figure, you see?
LRH: All right. Good enough.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Let me check this over now. Another What question here incidental, just to be checked.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What about these meetings with Gernie? Now there's a double tick on these meetings with Gernie.

PC: They're certainly occluded, in through here.

LRH: There it is.

PC: There's a year ...

LRH: There it is.

PC: See, there's a year going through there ...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... about that.

LRH: Hm.

PC: You know.

LRH: I'm going to put that down as a ...

PC: Boy, I sure had trouble with Gernie later on, so there must be – there must be something in there.

LRH: Yeah? You do something to her?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: What?

PC: Oh – I – later on there, I fought with her, you know?

LRH: All right.

PC: Fought with her ...

LRH: Did you do something to her specifically? We got a tick.

PC: Yeah. I – yeah, one time she wanted to – she wanted to come and have supper with me. I told her no, I was going to go with some other people.

LRH: Hm-km.

PC: I – I – you know, kind of pushed her away.

LRH: You what?

PC: I kind of repulsed her.

LRH: All right.

PC: Repulsed her and ...

LRH: Well, let me ask this question: What about refusing Gernie? No, that isn't live. It isn't quite right. What would you do to Gernie? You repulsed her, then.

PC: That time. Yeah.

LRH: Well, when was that?

PC: Was quite a bit later. This – I was back ...

LRH: Well, when was it?


LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: March of 60.

LRH: Is that all there is to it?

PC: Well, there's other stuff during that incident. She was producing; I was directing a production there.

LRH: Ah. You were working with her.

PC: Yeah, working together.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC: Long time.

LRH: Good. All right. And what didn't appear there?
PC: In that particular instance there of repulsing her? Well, some friendliness on my part didn't appear.

LRH: All right. Very good. And who didn't find out about it?

PC: Well, Gernie didn't, really.

LRH: Okay. Thank you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Let me ask you a couple of just leading questions here, could I?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Is there any affair – is there any affair with Gernie? Is there any refusal to have an affair with Gernie?

PC: Yeah. Not – do you mean love affair? Or ...

LRH: Yeah, I don't care.

PC: Yeah. It was never – it was – it was neither way, you know? It was – we got together one time and – on this American Theatre Association thing, and she said, "Fred," she said, "I'd help you, but I want something out of it."

LRH: Hm.

PC: And I – at that time I – I – I wondered – I had the consideration that, well, people should help me because they should help me, you know? Not because they want something out of me.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Yeah. And that – that I deserve to be helped. You know?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: I – I – and I don't – I don't need to give anything in return.

LRH: Ah.

PC: Except my – my "contribution of art to the world," you know?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: Or something like that – some jazz like that. I'm important enough, and I'm – you know, I should be helped and not be bothered about things like this, and what have you. I – I kind of left her with a maybe on that whole thing.

LRH: What did she mean by, she expected something out of it? What do you think she meant?

PC: Well, she – she expected to direct a play now and then, when she wanted to, you know ...

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: ... enter in artistically into the thing. And I wasn't interested in letting her do this. I didn't consider her capable at the time of ...

LRH: Did she ever find out about this?

PC: She never found out about that, no.

LRH: Oh. Is there a consistent withhold here on the subject of her capability?

PC: There certainly is, yeah. Certainly is. Certainly is. All through – all through our relationship. Kind of culminating up into producing this play ...

LRH: Hm.

PC: ... together.

LRH: Hm.
PC: I found out, in working together, that she was very capable.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: Before that – you know.

LRH: You had an opinion through that period?

PC: Yeah. Yeah.

LRH: All right. She didn't find out about this at any time?

PC: No.

LRH: Did Jack ever find out about this?

PC: No.

LRH: Might Jack have found out about this when he was auditing you?

PC: Yeah, he might have, if he'd...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... asked me.

LRH: Is there anything else about Gernie that Jack might have found out about? That's it.

PC: I – I had a feeling she was interested in me as a man, you see, sexually.

LRH: I see.

PC: I couldn't – you know. I wouldn't want Jack to know that, that I kind of got the idea from her. Not through any really terribly overt – kind of covertly, I mean.

LRH: I see.

PC: And I wouldn't want Jack to know about that.

LRH: All right. All right. Now let me disentangle ...

PC: Yes.

LRH: ... all of this a little bit here.

PC: Right.

LRH: And let me ask that question again, check it on the meter.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Might Jack have found out something about you and Gernie when he was auditing you? Getting a little action on this.

PC: Seems to be something else.

LRH: It's what something else?

PC: He might have found something else out – something else about me and Gernie, beside what I said.

LRH: Something else ...

PC: Yeah.

LRH: ... than this capability thing.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Was there anything else to find out? Got a reaction.

PC: I didn't like her!

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: I didn't like her.

LRH: Good. Well, might he have practically blown your head off if he'd fount out about your opinions with Gernie? What do you think? Something going on here.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: I'm trying to get to the bottom of it.

PC: Yeah. I – I – I don't know – I – my considerations at the time or my considerations now?
LRH: Your considerations at the time.

PC: *At the time. Well, you know, I – he might have – he might not have liked me, or something like that. But that's the missed withhold.*

LRH: All right. Very good. All right. Let me check this lineup now.

PC: *Yeah.*

LRH: Okay? What about conning Jack Campbell? Got a reaction.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: Instant reaction.

PC: *Hm.*

LRH: But it's not now the dirty needle reaction.

PC: *Yeah. I mean, there are some other times when I conned him, kind of.*

LRH: Oh, just give me a rapid rundown. What's the relationship here?

PC: *Well, I – I – I got some books from him and never paid him for the books.*

LRH: All right. Good. Thank you. Any other one?

PC: *Oh, I – I – I was going to trade twenty-five hours of auditing with him.*

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: *That's – that was a con, because he was a better auditor than I was.*

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: *Actually I got twelve and a half.*

LRH: Good. Good.

PC: *Uh...*
PC: And spent the time blaming Jack, kind of, for not – you know, for Mario – to let Mario – Jack, everybody else, whereby ... The overt was – golly, it's kind of – there's something to do with holding down the whole thing by myself ...

LRH: Hm.

PC: ... and proving to them that they were no good, or something like this. You know, I don't know.

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: Something like that.

LRH: Good enough. Thank you. All right, let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? All right. I don't know if that was a reaction or not, I'll check it again.

PC: Hm.

LRH: What about conning Jack Campbell? I've still got some kind of a reaction. Let's get the 1B checked here.

PC: All right.

LRH: What about these meetings with Gernie? All right, let me check it again. What about these meetings with Gernie? That is clean.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Now let me check the first one again. What about conning Jack Campbell? Let me check it again. What about conning Jack Campbell? I've still got a reaction on that.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: It's much quieter.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Everything is smoothing out. There is something else here. Is that the first meeting you had with Jack Campbell?

PC: Yeah!

LRH: Was it?

PC: Yeah!

LRH: All right.

PC: Far as I know.

LRH: Now, did you and Gernie talk about Jack Campbell? All right. There's no reaction there.

PC: Hm-m.

LRH: Is there any other con there that you might have skipped? Did you ever borrow money from him, or ...

PC: Yeah. Yeah.

LRH: ... never paid it back? You so far have just mentioned course fees, and so forth. Did you ever borrow money and not pay it back?

PC: I think I paid all the money back I borrowed from him.

LRH: I get no reaction on it.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Did you ever take a girl away from him?

PC: No.

LRH: Did you ever steal anything off of him?

PC: No.

LRH: All right. Did you ever take a fee while you were teaching there and didn't pay it back, or something like that?

PC: No. No.

LRH: Huh?

PC: No. Huh.
LRH: What do you mean?
PC: Oh, yeah!
LRH: What?
PC: Yeah, I just remembered an overt I got against him ...
LRH: Yeah, all right.
PC: ... on that.
LRH: What is it?
PC: While I was there, teaching – you know, teaching the course, holding things down, his – I'd use his office, you know, I mean, his office there.
LRH: Yeah, yeah.
PC: And he said, well, I wasn't supposed to go in the bottom left-hand drawer of his desk.
LRH: Right.
PC: I'm not supposed to touch that bottom left-hand drawer.
LRH: Okay.
PC: And so I went in the bottom – so I did go in the bottom left-hand drawer ...
LRH: All right.
PC: ... and rummaged around there a bit, and found some dirty pictures down there.
LRH: Okay.
PC: And never told him about that. Never told him about it.
LRH: Okay. Did he audit you after that?
PC: Yeah. Oh, yeah.
LRH: All right. Thank you. Thank you.
PC: Yeah.

LRH: Good enough. Now let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? Well, this is getting to look much cleaner.
PC: Yeah.
LRH: All right. What about conning Jack Campbell? I am not now getting an instant read ...
PC: Hm.
LRH: ... but it's a little bit before, and it's a little bit after.
PC: Yeah. Well, there's a lot of – must be a lot of – several other things I have done to him, you know?
LRH: Well, think of any offhand?
PC: Hm, hm, hm.
LRH: What's that?
PC: Oh, well, I – yeah. I conned him there.
LRH: What?
PC: I took the test, my final exam paper ...
LRH: Yeah.
PC: ... from the HPA, home, and did it at home ...
LRH: Oh, I see.
PC: ... in a sense. That's sort of a con. Well, yeah, because I – I – I went home and I – actually, when I took this paper home, I thought it was a joke about learning the Axioms. I – I – you know, learning, memorizing all those Axioms. That was silly.
LRH: Hm-hm.
PC: And when I – I came – I brought it back. I copied them out of the book, you know.
LRH: Hm.

PC: Brought them back, you know, I brought them back. And he looked at it, and he checked it over, with me there, and he saw that everything was perfect in it.

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: You know? And he looked at me kind of funny, like "Well, you got it right."

LRH: Hm.

PC: I conned him there, because I realized when he looked at me funny that I – it wasn't a joke. I should have memorized those Axioms.

LRH: Oh, I get you.

PC: And I – I hadn't.

LRH: All right.

PC: And – and at that moment I knew that – really that – that I hadn't. You know, I mean, I should have, or something, you know?

LRH: Hm-hm, yeah.

PC: And I conned him there.

LRH: Okay.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: We got it taped now.

PC: Hm.

LRH: All right. Let me check this question again. What about conning Jack Campbell? This looks fairly clean.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: I'll check it just one more time. What about conning Jack Campbell? I haven't got anything on it.

PC: Hm.

LRH: That's clean.

PC: That was a – that was a – actually, that was the big one there. I mean, that – that one there.

LRH: Yeah. That cleaned it. All right.

PC: Funny, because I told you about that once, but it wasn't – it wasn't as precise.

LRH: It wasn't "who missed the withhold," was it?

PC: Yeah. Yeah.

LRH: Yeah. Now, all right. Anything you care to say before we leave this Prepchecking?

PC: No. No.

LRH: All right. Are you sure of that?

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Anything you care to say before we leave this Prepchecking?

PC: Now about the double tick? Is that off?

LRH: I knew there was – I can't find it.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: It started disappearing when we cleaned up Gernie.

PC: Hm. Hm.

LRH: And I haven't seen it.

PC: Hm?

LRH: But ... you ask about it there. There's ...

PC: Hm.

LRH: ... there's a wide motion, there's a wider motion.
PC:  Hm-hm.
LRH: It's about so long, but it isn't the tick I had in the first place.
PC:  Hm.
LRH: I've got a tick here of some kind or another.
PC:  Hm.
LRH: It's not a tick. I've got a — a stop and a sweep.
PC:  Yeah.
LRH: But I was looking for a dirty little tick-tick.
PC:  Yeah.
LRH: And it seems to have dived for cover at the moment.
PC:  Hm.
LRH: There — no, there it is again.
PC:  Yeah.
LRH: Why? What are you thinking of, as you think of that?
PC:  I don't know. That's the funny thing, you see? I kind of look at something. I kind of look at an area of the bank.
LRH: Hm-hm.
PC:  You know, or something, or a piece of a ridge there, or something like that.
LRH: Well, that's all right.
PC:  You know? And I get it there ...
LRH: It's all right. It's all right. Okay.
PC:  I can bring it back by sweeping, you know? Scanning across.
LRH: Well, try it — to bring it back.
PC:  To bring it back? It's — I don't know.
PC:  Yeah, there's a little button there, it's — push — I don't know.
LRH: All right. There it is.
PC:  Creeps up on me. I was just trying there ...
LRH: All right. But do you think we've attained anything there, on that?
PC:  Yeah.
LRH: All right.
PC:  Okay.
LRH: Okay. Now, let's see what we've got here. Okay?
LRH: Have you told me any half-truth? What's the half-truth? That's it.
PC:  Oh, about writing those things for Robin, maybe. That's what I thought of ...
LRH: All right. All right.
PC:  ... right there.
LRH: Thank you. I'll check it on the meter. Have you told me any half-truth? Got it. Check, bang. It reacts.
LRH: Hm?
PC:  I don't know what it was.
LRH: Think of anything at all? What's that?
PC: Oh, well, there must be some other things with Jack, I think.
LRH: Oh, all right.
PC: You know.
LRH: All right.
PC: I was ...
LRH: You weren't satisfied that the What question was clean?
PC: Yeah, I was satisfied.
LRH: Yeah.
PC: There was probably other things on the chain there along some – you know, little ones ...
LRH: All right.
PC: ... like that, but not enough to ...
LRH: Okay.
PC: Hm.
LRH: Thank you. I'll check the auditing question. Have you told me any half-truth? Clean. Untruth? What's the untruth?
PC: Untruth.
LRH: That's it. Untruth.
PC: About Gernie? I don't know.
LRH: Think of an untruth?
PC: Well, she didn't actually – I don't think she really ever really insinuated that she was interested in me, sexually.
LRH: Ah.
PC: You know? I – it – I think it was mainly my own ideas or something. You know, I mean, I kind of switched things around or something.
LRH: All right. Okay. Have you told me any untruth? Got a reaction.
PC: Hm. Huh, I don't know what it is. Untruth.
LRH: There's something.
PC: I don't know what it is.
LRH: Something there.
PC: Yeah.
LRH: All right. I'll ask the question again.
PC: Yeah. Yeah.
LRH: Your answer is you don't know what it is?
PC: Yeah.
LRH: All right. Thank you.
PC: I- I got an idea.
LRH: What is it?
PC: Something about beginning rudiments.
LRH: Did you think one of them was still hot?
PC: Maybe I had kind of a suspicion or something. I wasn't sure.
LRH: Oh, yeah?
PC: Well, it could of – yeah, well, kind of a – of a missed withhold or something, you know?
LRH: All right. All right.
PC: I was – I was – when you said – when you asked about a present time problem, I had a tiny present time problem that I haven't been able to get to sleep too well ...
LRH: Yeah.
PC: ... over the last week or so.
LRH: Yeah.
PC: And I thought that it might show up. And then it didn't show up. And I thought it might show up, and uh – but it didn't show up.
LRH: Hm-hm.
PC: And so I thought maybe that was something wrong there.
LRH: All right. Is there an untruth? Was any of that an untruth?
PC: No, no, there wasn't an untruth on that.
LRH: Well, was it an untruth? Did you tell me that it ... ?
PC: An untruth, huh?
LRH: Thinking of something there.
PC: Well, yeah. If I said I had a present time problem and it didn't react on the meter, then it would be an untruth.
LRH: Is that right?
PC: Yes.
LRH: Is that what occurred?
PC: Yeah.
LRH: You're not sure?
PC: Yeah.
LRH: Is that your answer?
PC: Yeah.
LRH: All right. Very good. I will check that. All right. Have you told me an untruth? I get a reaction. Let me check it again ...
PC: Hm.
LRH: ... because you got a pretty dirty needle.
PC: Yeah.
LRH: Have you told me an untruth?
PC: Gee, I don't know what it is.
LRH: This is very equivocal.
PC: Yeah?
LRH: Do you have a guilty conscience about telling untruths or something of the sort here? This is not getting the same reaction ...
PC: Yeah.
LRH: ... constantly at all.
PC: I – I – I have a guilty conscience. It's just, you know, a general one-has-a-guilty-conscience guilty conscience, you know?
LRH: Well, does that upset you that I asked you if you've told an untruth?
PC: Yeah.
LRH: Is that what this is falling on?
PC: Yeah, maybe.
LRH: Well, is it or isn't it?
PC: Yeah, I didn't expect it to fall.
LRH: Oh, all right. Okay.
PC: Yeah.
LRH: All right. Let me check it again. Have you told me an untruth? Now, I still get a reaction on this. That's it.
PC: Oh. About my friend with the letter?
LRH: All right.
PC: My friend?
LRH: Well, what's the untruth there? That's it.
PC: Well, I'm not – I'm not absolutely positive I wrote it to the right address. Huh? Have to go back, I have to check my – my address book ...

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: ... to make sure, because I just – I wrote the address out, you know ...

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: ... after having remembered it. And I'm not – I have to check my address book.

LRH: All right. Thank you. Is there an untruth in that anyplace?

PC: Well, I said that ...

LRH: What was the untruth?

PC: Hm.

LRH: That's it.

PC: Well, that he – that I'm sure – well, that I'm sure that he would have – would have told me if he had moved.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: You know.

LRH: All right.

PC: And maybe he wouldn't have. I'm not sure that he would have told me that he moved.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Right.

LRH: Very good. Have you told me an untruth? All right. That's clean. Or said something only to impress me? I'll check that again. Have you said something only to impress me? Have you said something only to impress me? I haven't got any reaction on that. Your needle is banging around here ...

PC: Oh.

LRH: ... so I have to check it a little bit. Would you care to answer it?

PC: I was thinking maybe that this overt on Robin I said, but it wasn't only to impress you. No, it wasn't.

LRH: All right. Good.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Let me check it again.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Have you said something only to impress me? Now I am getting a kick on this.

PC: Oh, it wasn't only to impress you, but maybe I – it was a little bit to impress you. This overt on Robin, about writing him notes and stuff ...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... like that.

LRH: Okay. Thank you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Have you said something only to impress me? That's clean. Or tried to damage anyone in this session? Thank you. That's clean. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Now what's the ping on that?

PC: I was looking for that – that double tick.

LRH: Oh!

PC: You know?

LRH: All right. All right.

PC: Looking for the double tick that I had.

LRH: Very good. All right. I'll check that. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? I get a little tick on it still.
PC: Well, I implied that I could influence, I suppose, to a certain extent, if I could "push the button." I said I could "push the button" there and get a double tick.

LRH: Oh, yeah.

PC: You know, and that – if that was true, then I could push the button any time and get a double tick.

LRH: Yeah.

PC: Sort of push the button.

LRH: All right.

PC: That wasn't true, you know.

LRH: Okay. All right. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Very improbable. I will check it one more time.

PC: Oh, I don't want it to read when – when I can't find anything to – to – for it to read on.

LRH: Oh, I see.

PC: You see?

LRH: All right. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? I haven't got a reading here ...

PC: Yeah.

LRH: ... but subject seems to be kind of mucky.

PC: Well, I've kind of held my breath at times, hoping that I wouldn't get any read, or something on that. Read a body read or – I mean, it was silly, you know? I was sort of holding my breath or holding my body still and holding my hands still to make sure that the E-Meter doesn't read.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know.

LRH: Good. All right.

PC: Hm.

LRH: Okay. Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? Well, this is a bzz-bzz ...

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: ... sort of question. It isn't reacting very hard, but there's something there. Feel you gave me a lose by making – I was trying to clean up this double tick, or ...

PC: Something to do with that. No, not so much.

LRH: ... or something like that? Any feeling like that at all?

PC: Yeah. Well, yeah, maybe – maybe I thought it at the moment when I said "What happened to the double tick?"

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And I thought, well, the double tick should have gone by now, you see?

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: It cleared up with Gernie, then that was the end of the double tick.

LRH: Hm.

PC: Then it came back.

LRH: Hm.

PC: And in a sense I felt I influenced the E-Meter, or something, to bring it back on, you know, like that.

LRH: Hm. All right. Okay. Now let me check this question again.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Have you deliberately tried to influence the E-Meter? That is clean. All right. Have you failed to answer any ques-
tion or command I have given you in this session? Thank you. That's clean. Have you withheld anything from me? It's a trible latent ...

PC:  Yeah.

LRH:  ... but what is it?

PC:  I was thinking there was one, just – there was one question that I may have failed to answer ...

LRH: What was that?

PC:  ... much earlier, and I'm surprised it didn't react. I was thinking there was one, and it should have reacted.

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC:  Or something like that.

LRH: All right, what question was it?

PC:  The one about "What about those meetings in between?" I never did find a meeting in between ...

LRH: Oh, all right.

PC:  ... you see, those two.

LRH: Thank you. I'm sorry I asked you a double question there.

PC:  Yeah.

LRH: All right.

PC:  Yeah.

LRH: Have you withheld anything from me? I got a reaction.

PC:  I don't understand what you meant by double question. Or ...

LRH: I ask you a question, you answer it and I ask you another question. I was just apologizing

PC:  When was that? I...

LRH: Just a moment ago.

PC:  Hm.

LRH: All right. Let me check this ...

PC:  Yeah.

LRH: ... again. Hm? Have you withheld anything from me? Well, this – this is greasy. This hasn't anything to do with it.

PC:  Yeah.

LRH: Have you withheld anything from me? There is not an instant read on this.

PC:  Yeah.

LRH: Withheld? Well, there's a bing on withheld.

PC:  Yeah.

LRH: Withheld? Yes, there's a bing on withheld.

PC:  Lot of things I'd like to talk to you about. I – you know ...

LRH: Well, all right. Now, get the question here, now.

PC:  Yeah.

LRH: All right. Have you withheld anything from me? All right. It looks much cleaner.

PC:  Yeah. There's a lot of things I – I don't tell you or talk about, or something like that. You know, sometimes I ...
PC: ... and how many gains I have got and how tremendous I think it is. That's all.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know?

LRH: Very good.

PC: But it's not an overt act. I'm trying to give overt acts that I've done and I've withheld, you know, or something like that.

LRH: Oh, I see. All right. Have you withheld anything from me? There's a slight needle change ...

PC: Uh-huh.

LRH: ... right there on the end of that.

PC: Uh...

LRH: There it is. There it is.

PC: Yeah. All right. All right. This is very funny. I – I got myself in the front – right at the front of the class ...

LRH: Yeah.

PC: ... this week, under the assumption I was no longer an old – a new student – that I'm an old student. Last week Herbie caught me in the third row from the back, in the first lecture, and I – here you know I – I kind of snuck up to the third row that first day ...

LRH: Yeah.

PC: ... you know. He told me I could sit in back, you know ...

LRH: Yeah.

PC: ... new student, next time. Well, yesterday I got in the second row from the front ...

LRH: Uh-huh.

PC: ... and no one caught me at it. If – if now, as – a little games condition thing there, and I was just seeing if – if the second week, if you're still a new student, and – and if I wouldn't be (a) I wouldn't get caught at it or (b) I would – could argue my way out that I was a new student.

LRH: All right.

PC: And – or something like that. Anyway, it's silly.

LRH: All right. Thank you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Have you withheld anything from me? A halt as it goes, as it comes back up.

PC: Hm.

LRH: There.

PC: Hm.

LRH: There. What are you thinking about?

PC: Well, I ...

LRH: There.

PC: I had an argument with – a little argument with Robin.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: ... about – after I took over the post.

LRH: Hm-hm.

PC: And I ... oh, I don't know, I didn't tell you about it.

LRH: All right. Very good.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay?

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Is that it?

PC: Yeah.
LRH: All right. Let me check this question on the meter. Have you withheld anything from me? It's just a little roughness. Pretty clean. Just a little roughness.

PC: Hm-hm.

LRH: Hardly detectable. A slowed rise.

PC: I'm trying to differentiate between motivators and, you know, overt acts, and what's really a withhold, and what isn't, and, you know, I'm still a little confused on that.

LRH: All right.

PC: And...

LRH: Does that answer the question?

PC: Yeah. And I'm not sure what – what a withhold is at this point, in a sense, you see?

LRH: Oh.

PC: And...

LRH: I see.

PC: Because it ...

LRH: I get you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Well, go ahead, if you want.

PC: Well, it's just a "damage somebody," you know? I mean, it's not – see, I'm confused.

LRH: All right.

PC: You know, it's – it's that – that's – it's – it's – it's not a withhold, really, because I wouldn't mind telling you

LRH: All right.

PC: You see?

LRH: All right.
PC: And I put in some – made franchises a little stiffer, you know, to get a franchise.

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: And made co-audit centers beef it up a little bit to – you know, to get more information to them for people who didn't, I felt, deserve franchises or, you know, because they weren't working at it, you know?

LRH: Hm-m.

PC: To kind of give them a gradient to get up to a franchise. Well, I withheld from you telling you that – that since Robin had taken over he's – he's switched it back and made franchise very easy to get, you know, and everything else. And I think that's wrong. And I withheld telling you that I think it's wrong.

LRH: All right. Okay.

PC: But it's none of my business anymore.

LRH: All right.

PC: Huh.

LRH: Thank you.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Okay. Let me check the question. Have you withheld anything from me? Well, it's clean.

PC: Yeah. Oh, is it?

LRH: All right. Okay. Look around here and tell me if you can have anything. Thank you. Squeeze them cans. All right. Squeeze the cans. All right. Put the cans up on the table.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: All right. Touch the table. Now, we were running Feel, weren't we?

PC: Yeah, well, same thing.

LRH: Does it mean anything?

PC: Yeah, yeah.

LRH: All right. Okay. Touch the table. Thank you. Touch your chair. Thank you. Touch that. Good. Thank you. Touch the table. Good. Good. Touch the top of your head. Good. Thank you. Touch the table. Good. Touch your chair. Good. All right. Pick up the cans. Okay. Squeeze the cans. That's much better. Squeeze them again. All right. We are going to let it go at that. Thank you. All right. Made any part of your goals for this session?

PC: I think so.

LRH: Okay. All right.

PC: I think cleaning off this stuff on Jack will help me in Scientology – (a) in Scientology, help me in my – in studying.

LRH: Stay in PT while studying? All right.

PC: Yeah.

LRH: Good.

PC: And – what was my other goal?

LRH: Sleep.

PC: Sleep?

LRH: Sleep at night?

PC: Yeah. Yeah. Yeah, no trouble. No trouble. Won't have any trouble.

LRH: You're postulating that, or do you – do you know?

PC: No, I know. I just know.

LRH: All right.

PC: I'll just go to sleep easily.

LRH: You're not trying to make me look good?
PC: No, no.

LRH: All right.

PC: No. I – I just – I just feel better, and feel kind of tired, and feel like sleeping, instead of nervously tired. There's a difference.

LRH: All right. Okay. Okay.

PC: Yeah. I've been nervous. And I don't feel as nervous now.

LRH: All right.

PC: So...

LRH: I see. All right. Well, have you made any other gains in this session you care to mention?

PC: Cleaned up on Scientology.

LRH: All right.

PC: Remembered a few things, that...

LRH: Okay.

PC: ... didn't remember otherwise.

LRH: Anything else?

PC: Hm ... I just feel more rested...

LRH: All right.

PC: ... you know. I don't feel as frantic as I used to feel.

LRH: Good. All right. Thank you.

PC: I got on television again. [laughs]
An instant read is defined as that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the auditor.

The reaction of the needle may be any reaction except „nul“”. An instant read may be any change of characteristic providing it occurs instantly. The absence of a read at the end of the major thought shows it to be nul.

All prior reads and latent reads are ignored. These are the result of minor thoughts which may or may not be restimulated by the question.

Only the instant read is used by the auditor. Only the instant read is cleared on rudiments, What questions, etc.

The instant read may consist of any needle reaction, rise, fall, speeded rise, speeded fall, double tick (dirty needle), theta bop or any other action so long as it occurs at the exact end of the major thought being expressed by the auditor. If no reaction occurs at exactly that place (the end of the major thought) the question is nul.

By „major thought” is meant the complete thought being expressed in words by the auditor. Reads which occur prior to the completion of the major thought are „prior reads”. Reads which occur later than its completion are „latent reads”.

By „minor thought” is meant subsidiary thoughts expressed by words within the major thought. They are caused by the reactivity of individual words within the full words. They are ignored.

Example: „Have you ever injured dirty pigs?”

To the pc the words „you”, „injured” and „dirty” are all reactive. Therefore, the minor thoughts expressed by these words also read on the meter.

The major thought here is the whole sentence. Within this thought are the minor thoughts „you”, „injured” and „dirty”.

Therefore the E-Meter needle may respond this way: „Have you (fall) ever injured (speeded fall) dirty (fall) pigs (fall)?”

Only the major thought gives the instant read and only the last fall (bold-italic type in the sentence above) indicates anything. If that last reaction was absent, the whole sentence is nul despite the prior falls.
You can release the reactions (but ordinarily would not) on each of these minor thoughts. Exploring these prior reads is called „compartmenting the question“. Paying attention to minor thought reads gives us laughable situations as in the case, written in 1960, of „getting P.D.H.ed by the cat”. By accepting these prior reads one can prove anything. Why? Because Pain and Drug and Hypnosis are minor thoughts within the major thought: „Have you ever been P.D.H.ed by a cat?“ The inexpert auditor would believe such a silly thing had happened. But notice that if each minor thought is cleaned out of the major thought it no longer reacts as a whole fact. If the person on the meter had been P.D.H.ed by a cat, then only the discovery of the origin of the whole thought would clean up the whole thought.

Pcs also think about other things while being asked questions and these random personal restimulations also read before and after an instant read and are ignored. Very rarely, a pc’s thinks react exactly at the end of a major thought and so confuse the issue, but this is rare.

We want the read that occurs instantly after the last syllable of the major thought without lag. That is the only read we regard in finding a rudiment in or out, to find if a goal reacts, etc. That is what is called an „instant read”.

There is a package rudiment question in the half truth, etc. We are doing four rudiments in one and therefore have four major thoughts in one sentence. This packaging is the only apparent exception but is actually no exception. It’s just a fast way of doing four rudiments in one sentence.

A clumsy question which puts „in this session” at the end of the major thought can serve the auditor badly. Such modifiers should come before the sentence, „In this session have you……?“

You are giving the major thought directly to the reactive mind. Therefore any analytical thought will not react instantly.

The reactive mind is composed of:

1. Timelessness.
2. Unknownness.

The meter reacts on the reactive mind, never on the analytical mind. The meter reacts instantly on any thought restimulated in the reactive mind.

If the meter reacts on anything, that datum is partly or wholly unknown to the preclear. An auditor’s questions restimulate the reactive mind. This reacts on the meter.

Only reactive thoughts react instantly.

You can „groove in” a major thought by saying it twice. On the second time (or third time if it is longer) you will see only the instant read at the exact end. If you do this the prior reads drop out leaving only the whole thought.

If you go stumbling around in rudiments or goals trying to clean up the minor thoughts you will get lost. In sec checking you can uncover material by „compartmenting the question”
but this is rarely done today. In rudiments, What questions, et al, you want the instant read only. It occurs exactly at the end of the whole thought. This is your whole interest in cleaning a rudiment or a What question. You ignore all prior and latent reactions of the needle.

The exceptions to this rule are:

1. „Compartmenting the question”, in which you use the prior reads occurring at the exact end of the minor thoughts (as above in the pigs sentence) to dig up different data not related to the whole thought.

2. „Steering the pc” is the only use of latent or random reads. You see a read the same as the instant read occurring again when you are not speaking but after you have found a whole thought reacting. You say „there” or „that” and the pc, seeing what he or she is looking at as you say it, recovers the knowledge from the reactive bank and gives the data and the whole thought clears or has to be further worked and cleared.

You can easily figure-figure yourself half to death trying to grapple with meter reads unless you get a good reality on the instant read which occurs at the end of the whole expressed thought and neglect all prior and latent reads except for steering the pc while he gropes for the answer to the question you asked.

That’s the whole of reading an E-Meter needle.

(Two Saint Hill lectures of 24 May 1962 cover this in full.)

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:jw.rd

[HCO B 21 July 1962, Instant Reads, adds to this HCO B.]
HUBBARD COMMUNICATIONS OFFICE
Saint Hill Manor, East Grinstead, Sussex
HCO POLICY LETTER OF 26 MAY 1962

Franchise
Central Orgs
Tech Depts
IMPORTANT

TRAINING DRILLS
MUST BE CORRECT

TRs which give an incorrect impression of how auditing is done may not be taught.

All TRs must contain the correct data of auditing.

This is vital. There have been two broad instances where TRs gave an impetus to improper auditing which all but crippled the forward advance of Scientology.

These were:

Upper Indoc TRs which caused students to conceive that the CCHs were run without 2-way comm and with a militant, even vicious attitude. (See HCO Bulletins of April 5 and 12, 1962.)

E-Meter Needle drills which caused the student to believe that every action of the needle was a read and prevented three-quarters of all Scientologists from ever getting rudiments in or questions cleared (see HCO Bulletin of May 25, 1962 and 2 Saint Hill Lectures of May 24, 1962).

In the matter of the CCHs, we were deprived of their full use for 5 years and extended the time in processing 25 times more than should have been consumed for any result. This came from TRs 6-9 which are hereby scrapped.

In the matter of the E-Meter it is probable that all auditing failures and widely extended false ideas that Scientology did not work stem from the improper conception of what action of the needle one cleaned up. This came from needle reading TRs where instructors had students calling off every activity of the needle as a read, whereas only the needle action at the exact end of the question was used by the auditor. Auditors have thought all needle actions were reads and tried to clean off all needle actions except, in some cases, the end actions. This defeated the meter completely and upset every case on which it was practised. This accounts for all auditing failures in the past two years.

CCHs must be taught exactly as they are used in session, complete with two-way comm and no comm system added, please.
E-Meter drills must be used which stress only meaningful and significant instant reads coming at the end of the full question.

Other actions of the needle may be shown to a student only if they are properly called *prior* and *latent* reads, or meaningless action. From his earliest training on meters the student must be trained to consider a *read* only what he would take up in session and clear or use, and must be taught that mere actions of the needle are neglected except in steering the pc, fishing or compartmenting questions.

**Only teach proper use. Only use TRs which exactly parallel use of Scientology in session and do not give an impression that something else is used.**

I have seen clearly that Scientology’s effectiveness could be destroyed by teaching via TRs which can be interpreted by a student as the way to audit when in fact one does not audit that way or use the data in auditing.

There are many valuable TRs. There will be many more valuable TRs. But an *invalid TR* is one which gives a wrong impression of auditing. These must be kept out of all training.

L. RON HUBBARD

LRH:gl.rd
REPETITIVE RUDIMENTS

HOW TO GET THE RUDIMENTS IN

I am in a hurry to get this bulletin to you and to get it into use for all except CCH sessions.

For a long time I’ve been urging you to get rudiments in. For the past ten days I have been working hard to analyze and resolve why you sometimes cannot.

Just as an E-Meter can go dead for the auditor in the presence of a monstrous ARC break, I have found it can go gradiently dull in the presence of out rudiments. If you fail to get one in then the outness of the next one reads faintly. And if your TR1 is at all poor, you’ll miss the rudiment’s outness and there goes your session.

To get over these difficulties, I have developed a Model Session that can be used, in the rudiments, as a series of repetitive processes.

Then, with this, I’ve developed Repetitive Rudiments.

The auditor at first does not consult the meter, but asks the rudiments question of the pc until the pc says there is no further answer. At this point the auditor says, “I will check that on the meter.” And asks the question again. If it reads, the auditor uses the meter to steer the pc to the answer, and when the pc finds the answer, the auditor again lays the meter aside and asks the question of the pc as above until the pc has no answer. The auditor again says, “I will check that on the meter” and does so.

The cycle is repeated over and over until the meter is clean of any instant read (see HCO Bulletin of May 25, 1962 for Instant Read).

The cycle:

1. Run the rudiment as a repetitive process until pc has no answer.
2. Consult meter for a hidden answer.
3. If meter reads use it to steer (“that” “that” each time the meter flicks) the pc to the answer.
4. Lay aside the Meter and do 1 and 2 and 3.

The process is flat when there is no instant read to the question.

One does not “bridge out” or use “two more commands”. When the meter test of the question gets no instant read, the auditor says, “Do you agree that that is clean?” covertly looking at the needle as he or she says “clean”. If the question really isn’t clean, there will be
an instant read on “Do you agree the question is clean?” If there is such a read, do 1, 2 and 3 again.

The trick here is the definition of “In Session”. If the pc is in session the meter will read. If the pc is partially out the meter will read poorly, and the rudiment will not register and the rudiment will get missed. But with the pc in session the meter will read well for the auditor. Thus you get the pc to talk to the auditor about his own case, the definition of “in session”, before consulting the meter by using the repetitive process.

What a relief to the pc to have his rudiments in! And goodbye ARC breaks and no auditing results!

Use this system always on the beginning rudiments for every type of session.

Use this system on the Middle Rudiments in a havingness and sometimes on the Prepcheck type of session. But seldom on a Routine 3 (goals) type of session.

Use this system always on the End Rudiments of a havingness session. Do not use it on the End Rudiments of a Prepcheck or Routine 3 type of session unless the session has been full of screaming pc (which with this system it won’t be).

- Havingness Type Session:
  Repetitive Rudiments System on Beginning, Middle and End Rudiments.

- Prepcheck Type Session:
  Repetitive Rudiments on Beginning and sometimes Middle Rudiments. Ask End Rudiments against meter as in step 2 and 3 of cycle (Fast Checking, see below).

- Routine 3 Type Session:
  Use Repetitive Rudiments on Beginning Rudiments. Use 2 and 3 only (Fast Checking) for Middle and End Rudiments unless Session very rough.

So that’s where Repetitive auditing processes wind up. Addressed to rudiments!

A tip – you can ARC break a session by overuse of Middle Rudiments on Routine 3 processes. Never use the Middle Rudiments just because the pc is talking about his or her own case. That’s the definition of In Session. Use Middle Rudiments in Routine 3 when you have not had any meter needle response on three goals read three times (not one goal read disturbed the needle). Then get your Middle Rudiments in and cover the first consecutive nul goal above (the three that gave no response). Don’t use Middle Ruds just because 3 goals went nul. Only if no reading of a goal disturbed the needle for three goals in a row. Also use Middle Ruds when the pc “can’t think of any more” in listing of goals or items. Don’t use every time you shift lists now. Only if the pc “can’t list more”.

INSTANT READS BRIEFING 42 06.02.10
In Prepchecking use Middle Ruds Repetitively after 3 Zero questions have each been nul on a list of Zeros and recheck those Zeros if Middle Ruds were out. Use Middle Ruds after each What question was nulled and check the What question again and rework it if alive. Also check the Zero questions if a What went nul. If a Zero advanced to a What, both What and Zero must be checked for nullness and found nul before leaving them.

One Middle Rudiments use may suffice for both unless one was found still alive after the Middle Ruds were gotten in. Repair it and recheck if so.

__FAST CHECKING__

A Fast Check on the Rudiments consists only of steps 2 and 3 of the cycle done over and over.

Watching the meter the auditor asks the question, takes up only what reads and, careful not to Q and A, clears it. One does this as many times as is necessary to get a clean needle. But one still says, “Do you agree that that is clean?” and catches up the disagreement by getting the additional answers. When both the question and the agreement are seen to be clean, the question is left.

In using Fast Checking _never say, “that still reads.”_ That’s a flunk. Say, “There’s _another_ read here.”

You cannot easily handle a transistor type meter more sensitive than a Mark IV. The needle would be so rapid in its swings you would find it nearly impossible to keep it centred. Therefore a more sensitive meter was no answer. The TR 1 of many auditors lacks any great impingement. And this is remediable only when “altitude” can also be remedied. There had to be a better answer to getting out rudiments to read better on a Meter for all auditors and all pcs. Repetitive Rudiments is the best answer to this.

(Note: I am indebted to Mary Sue, when I was working on this problem, for calling my attention back to this system which I originally developed for Sec Checking and where it worked well.)

L. RON HUBBARD
URGENT

AUDITING ALLOWED

I want every auditor auditing to be perfect on a meter. To be otherwise can be catastrophic.

By perfect is meant:

1. Auditor never tries to clean a clean read;
2. Auditor never misses a read that is reacting.

One mistake on M.S. or TRs may not ruin a session. One mistake on a meter read can ruin a session. That gives you the order of importance of accurate never-miss meter reading.

All bad auditing results have now been traced to inaccuracy in meter reading. Other aspects of a session should be perfect. But if the session, even vaguely following a pattern session, comes to grief, it is only meter reading accuracy that is at fault.

I have carefully ferreted this fact out. There is only one constant error in sessions that produce no results or poor results; inaccurate meter reading. This is also true for student and veteran auditors alike.

When an auditor starts using unusual solutions, he or she was driven to them by the usual solution not working. The usual solution always works unless the meter needle reading is inaccurate.

If an auditor is using unusual solutions, then that auditor’s meter reading is inaccurate. Given this, consequent ARC breaks and failures drive the auditor to unusual solutions.

A D of P who has to dish out unusual solutions has auditors who are missing meter reads.

Meter reading must be perfect every session. What is perfect?

1. Never try to clean a read that is already clean.
2. Never miss an instant reaction of the needle.

If you try to clean a clean rudiment, the pc has the missed withhold of nothingness. The auditor won’t accept the origination or reply of nothingness. This can cause a huge ARC break, worse than missing a somethingness. A nothingness is closer to a thetan than somethingness.
If you miss an instant reaction you hang the pc with a missed withhold and the results can be catastrophic.

If you fumble and have to ask two or three times, the read damps out, the meter can become inoperative on that pc for the session.

If you miss on one rudiment, the next even if really hot can seem to be nul by reason of ARC break.

A meter goes nul on a gradient scale of misses by the auditor. The more misses, the less the meter reads.

Meter perfection means only accurate reading of the needle on instant reads. It is easily attained.

An auditor should never miss on a needle reaction. To do so is the basis of all unsuccessful sessions. Whatever else was wrong with the session, it began with bad meter reading.

Other auditing actions are important and must be done well. But they can all be overthrown by one mistake in metering.

1. Never clean a clean needle.
2. Never miss a read.

Unless metering perfection is attained by an auditor, he or she will continue to have trouble with preclears.

The source of all upset is the missed withhold.

The most fruitful source of missed withholds is poor metering.

The worst TR 4 is failure to see that there is nothing there or failing to find the something that is there on an E-Meter.

This is important: Field Auditors, Academies and HGCs are all being deprived of the full benefit of processing results by the one read missed out of the 200 that were not missed. It is that critical!

A good pro, by actual inspection, is at this moment missing about eight or nine reads per session, calling one that is clean a read and failing to note a read that read.

_This is_ the 5 to 1 ratio noted between HGC auditing and my auditing. They miss a few. I don’t. If I don’t miss meter reads, and don’t have ARC breaky pcs, why should you? With modern session pattern and processes well learned, all you have to acquire is the ability to never miss on reading a needle. If I can do it you can.

L. RON HUBBARD
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E-METER DRILL-22

Number: EM-22.

Name: E-Meter Hidden Date, This Life.

Purpose: To train the student auditor to locate a date on the track with the E-Meter, to increase the student auditor’s reality on the factualness of an E-Meter and the factualness of the time track, and to give the student auditor a great familiarity with the E-Meter and its use.

Position: The student auditor and coach sit facing each other across a table. The student auditor handles the meter, while the coach holds the electrodes.

Commands: No set commands. “Over and under” method of questioning is used to isolate the correct date.

Training Stress: The coach is to select a date, preferably his birthday or any known anniversary. Later as the student auditor gets better, the coach is to select any date (month, day, and year) at random from the early years of his present lifetime. He does not tell the student what the date is. The student auditor, by the use of the meter, is to find the date the coach has selected, without the coach replying or saying anything at all except for coaching instructions.

A date is found by the process of elimination. The student auditor’s questions are of this sort: “Is the date before 1940 A.D. . . . After 1940 A.D.?” If the needle reacts, the answer is yes. If the needle doesn’t react, the answer is no. If the needle reacts on the first question, then the second question is not asked. If the needle does not react on either question, then the student auditor does not have a year even close to the right one or he has been asking the questions with poor TR-1.

After the year is found, then the student auditor locates the month of the year, “Is it before June, 1945 A.D. . . . After June 1945 A.D.?” Then the day is found, “Is it before March 15, 1945 A.D. . . . After March 15, 1945 AD.?”

As the student auditor improves, the coach should increase the difficulty of the date to be found by selecting month, day, year and also minutes and seconds.

The student auditor may use “before” and “after”, but not “more than. . . . less than. . . .” for this lifetime.

The coach should flunk the student auditor for TR’s 0 to 2, if poor; for ambiguous, indirect Q and A type of questions; for improper interpretation of the E-Meter reads; or for taking an excessive amount of time.

The student auditor passes this drill when he can easily, correctly, and accurately date on the E-Meter.

ROUTINE 2H
ARC BREAKS BY ASSESSMENT

This is not just a training process. It is a very valuable unlimited process that undercuts Repetitive Processes and produces tone arm action on cases that have none on repetitive processes.

R2H, however, is a training must before an auditor is permitted to run engrams. It does not have to be run on a pc before engrams are run. Only when an auditor can produce results with R2H should he or she run engrams on any pc. For R2H combines the most difficult steps of engram running, dating, assessing, locating and indicating by-passed charge. If an auditor can date skillfully and quickly handle ARC Breaks (and handle the Time Track) he or she is a safe auditor on R3R. If not, that auditor will not produce results with R3R or make any OTs.

In Academies and the SHSBC, R2H is placed after skill is attained in Model Session and repetitive processes. In auditing programming R2H comes immediately after Reach and Withdraw and the CCHs.

For sweetening a pc’s temper and life, R2H has had no equal for cases above but not including level 8.

ARC stands for the Affinity–Reality–Communication triangle from which comes the Tone Scale and is best covered by the booklet “Notes on Lectures”.

By-passed charge is covered very fully in recent HCOBs on ARC Breaks.

R2H BY STEPS

The auditing actions of Routine 2H are complex and must be done with great precision.

The actions are done in Routine 3 Model Session. Mid Ruds and Missed Withholds may be used.

Step One:

Tell the pc, “Recall an ARC Break.”
When pc has done so acknowledge that the pc has done so. Do not ask the pc what it is. If pc says what it is, simply acknowledge. It is no business of R2H to know what the ARC Break consists of!

**Step Two:**

Date the ARC Break on the meter. If the pc volunteers the date *do not* verify it on the meter further. Accept it at once and write it down. The date is more important than the content of the ARC Break.

**Step Three:**

Assess the ARC Break for by-passed charge, using the attached list.

Find the greatest read.

The assessment is seldom gone over more than once as a whole and those that read are then read again until one remains.

This is a rapid action on the meter. Look only for tiny ticks or falls or a small left to right slash of the needle. Do not expect large reactions. The Mark V meter is indispensable.

**Step Four:**

Indicate to the pc what charge was missed in that ARC Break he or she has recalled.

The pc must be satisfied that that was the charge missed.

The pc may try to recall what it was that was indicated. This is not a vital part of the drill but the pc must be satisfied that the located by-passed charge was the source of the ARC break.

There is a danger here of a great deal of auditor ad-libbing and tanglefoot. If the pc is not satisfied and happier about it, the wrong by-passed charge has been found and Step Three must be re-done.

It is no part of this process to run an engram or secondary thus located.

**THE ASSESSMENT FORM**

This is a *sample* form. It may be necessary to add to it. Some lines of it may eventually be omitted. However, this form does work. The auditor may add a few lines to it.

In asking the questions preface the whole assessment with, “In the ARC Break you recalled ______.” Do not preface each question so unless pc goes adrift.

A dirty needle means pc has started to speculate. Ask, “Have you thought of anything?” and clean needle.
Had an engram been missed?
Had a withhold been missed?
Had some emotion been rejected?
Had some affection been rejected?
Had a reality been rejected?
Had a communication been ignored?
Had a similar incident occurred before?
Had a goal been disappointed?
Had some help been rejected?
Was an engram restimulated?
Had an overt been committed?
Had an overt been contemplated?
Had an overt been prevented?
Was there a secret?

Routine 2H is a skilled operation. Practice gives the auditor a knack of doing it rapidly.

An ARC Break should be disposed of about every fifteen minutes of auditing time. Longer shows ineptitude.

L. RON HUBBARD
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It occasionally comes to my attention that auditors entering Classes V and VI do not believe a meter can be made to read *big*.

They settle for ticks, tiny falls, etc, of the sort that can be found usually in getting Mid Ruds in. In all auditing up to Class V the usual meter needle read is around an eighth to a quarter of an inch long at sensitivity 16.

The Mark V is designed to give good serviceable reads for the lower classes of auditing and is quite wonderful at it.

But the moment you enter the wide vistas of Class V, the whole character of meter needle behaviour changes, you go from tiny read to big read.

In Classes V and VI tiny reads are used only for Mid Ruds as they were in lower levels. But in all work in goals, Case Analysis, plotting, finding items, checking things out, etc, reads are enormous.

A new horizon of metering dawns and an auditor coming up through the lower levels, entering Class V and VI work just doesn’t believe it. Most of his early mistakes in checking out goals or finding the wrongnesses are entirely based on this. He thinks a tiny read is enough and he uses it. Whereas he really must never use a small read for this work.

If a goal is a real GPM it will read with great, intermittent, inconsistent slashes. If an analysis of a situation is brought to the right answer, the meter needle falls hugely.

The trouble is that the auditor just doesn’t press on looking for the right answer and settles for ticks – because he can’t think up the right combination. The right combination “No GPM” or “Lock on an Implant” will send the needle racing.

All mistakes on goals or situations in Classes V and VI can be traced to a failure to appreciate that metering is different at these levels.

The sensitivity at Class VI has to be kept around 4. You only use sensitivity 8 or 16 to get in Since Mid Ruds. On all R6 work you shut the meter down. You can’t keep the needle at Set if you use a sensitivity higher than 4.

Here’s a Class V or VI student fiasco, based on using Class III expected meter behaviour on high level work:

Auditor finds goal on list that ticks ($\frac{1}{8}$”). Asks if it’s the correctly worded goal. Gets a tick ($\frac{1}{16}$”). Runs it on the pc. Pc collapses.
Here’s the real way it should have been: Auditor finds goal on list that only ticks. Gets in Suppress and Invalidate on the list. Re-nulls. Finds another goal. Gets in Suppress on it. Gets a third of a dial instant slash (all goals and items must Instant read). Checks it out until he gets a 3” prior slash on Actual GPM. Gets a 2” slightly latent or prior slash on “correctly worded”. Gives it to the pc and pc thrives.

It’s not asking the right question (what it really is) that gives you ticks.

In fact a tick with a sharp edge at Class V or VI really means “wrong question asked”!

Big reads are the only reads you buy at Class V and VI. Learn the right questions to ask about the character or nature of what you’re examining and you get the big falls, RRs, etc.

So it’s a lack of knowledge of Track Analysis that makes the auditor fall back on small reads. And he’ll fail.

The second stage of desperation enters at Class V and VI when the student, hammered by the instructors, still can’t get big reads (through lack of knowledge of the track and what things can be).

The student then abandons all he knew about body motion causing needle reaction. The quickly exhaled breath, the shuffled feet, the can fling about, the stretch, the can bang, all cause big surges. So the auditor encourages the pc to shout goals and items or fling himself about so the meter will react big.

This, of course, will spin the pc, getting no charge off, running wrong goals and RIs.

By the time the student auditor is trained not to take body motion, shout or breath reads, his Track Analysis has also improved and he starts to ask the right questions and gets his big reads with the pc quiet as a lamb.

I never touch a TA during the pc’s body movement. This loses TA, of course, since a pc is most likely to move when an RI starts to discharge. I never buy a goal unless I’ve seen it Instant read, bang on the last letter. I never ask the character of anything to Instant read, i.e. “Is this an Implant GPM”, because it may go on anticipate or arrive latent.

And do I get TA on the pc! In goals finding and plotting you don’t expect much TA. Yet in six consecutive sessions I built TA a few divisions more per session, from 70 TA down divisions to 103 TA down divisions in 2½ hour session, and all by never buying a tick, only big RRs or falls. Gradual build of TA shows all is well.

So Classes V and VI are not only big read classes, but they are big TA classes as well.

As you are handling the basic sources of charge on a case in Classes V and VI, you expect big meter behaviour and you get it.

Only ignorance of the track keeps the auditor in the small read, small TA departments.

If you keep on trying to get what it really is until you have it, you will always see a big read on what it is.

You wouldn’t expect to handle high voltage wires with tiny sparks. You would expect huge arcs to crackle. Similarly with the materials of Classes V and VI.
If you don’t believe a meter will read big at Classes V and VI, then you haven’t learned yet to find the right things and ask the right questions.

And if you settle for ticks or have to make the pc yell items to get big reads you’ll soon have a very messed up case on your hands.

So it’s a different meter behaviour at the higher classes. Expect it, look for it and make it read!

L RON HUBBARD
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ASSESSMENT

Assessment means the locating on a prepared list, one item.

Listing and Nulling means the pc lists.

The laws of listing and nulling apply only to Listing and nulling. It is auditing.

The actions of assessment do not apply to listing and nulling and never have.

Assessment is from a prepared list. It was done around 1960. It still is used. It has its own actions.

But as the prepared lists as in Pre-have become bulky, I then developed a new action where the pc listed.

Do not apply the rules of assessment as in the E-Meter book to Listing and Nulling.

These are two different actions entirely.

The key is that a list for assessment is always from a list prepared by the auditor or from an HCO B as in “7 resistive cases”.

S & Ds, Remedy Bs, etc, are listed by the pc and follow the Laws of listing and nulling.

This is assessment, a list prepared by the C/S or auditor, not the pc.

To get a clue to what happened, the C/S prepares a list:

- Lions X
- Big Game / X
- Cats X
- Felines / X
- Tigers X
- Bearers X
- Trucks X
- Elephants X
- Killing F / LF BD
- Camping X
Then the auditor nulls it to one item.

This is then prepchecked or done on an L1 as a subject.

When you list and null the pc gives the list.

Who got shot?

- Me X X
- Joe X X
- Bearers F // X
- Elephants X X
- Tigers LF BD / F X

The auditor nulls this (Xes and second action noted).

Two items are now reading so the auditor extends the list -

Ext

________

IND

- The White Hunter F / LF BD
- The Dog X

And then the auditor renulls the whole list (second X, etc) and only one item stays in which is a complete list. That is the item. It is given to pc.

L. RON HUBBARD
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FLYING RUDS

To clarify how to fly ruds:

If a rud reads, you get the data and then ask for earlier until you get an F/N.

If a rud doesn’t read, put in Suppress and recheck. If it gets any comment, natter or protest or bewilderment, put in False and clean it.

To fly all ruds you ask for an ARC Brk, if no read, put in Suppress. If it reads take it, do ARCU CDEI Earlier ARCU CDEI Earlier until you get an F/N. Then do the same with PTP. Then with MW/Hs.

If in starting a rud does not read or F/N even if Suppress is put in go to the next rud until you get one that does read. Follow it earlier to F/N.

Then F/N the 2 that didn’t read.

INCORRECT

To get a rud reading with or without Suppress and then fail to follow it earlier and to continue to call it and take only reads is incorrect.

CORRECT

If a rud reads you always follow it earlier until it F/Ns.

You do not continue to test it with a meter and do not leave it just because it fails to read again.

If a rud reads you clean it with earlier, earlier to F/N.

If a rud reads and the read is false you clean false.

There are two actions possible in flying ruds.

1. The rud is not out. If it didn’t read you check suppress. If it read but is in any way protested you clean false.

2. The rud is out. You get the data, you follow it earlier earlier until it F/Ns. You do not continue to check it for reads.
GREEN FORM

This applies also to handling ruds on the Green Form.

ARC BREAK

If there is an ARC Break you get it, use ARCU and CDEI, indicate, then if no F/N you follow it earlier, get ARCU CDEI, indicate, if no F/N you get an earlier one on and on, always with ARCU CDEI until you get an F/N.

PTP

If you get a PTP you follow it earlier earlier earlier until you get an F/N.

MISSED WITHHOLD

If you get a withhold you find out who missed it, then another and another using Suppress. If protest you put in false. You will find these W/Hs also go earlier like any other chain but they don’t have to.

MIXING METHODS

If you get a rud read and the pc gives you one you don’t then check the read again. You get more until you get an F/N.

To get a rud answered and then check suppress and its read is mixing 1 and 2 above.

FALSE

“Has anyone said you had a …… when you didn’t have one?” is the answer to protested ruds.

Any VIII should be able to fly any rud at will. The above clarifies HCOB and Tape data on this subject.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
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UNREADING QUESTIONS AND ITEMS

(With particular reference to doing
a Group Engram Intensive)

Never list a listing question that doesn’t read.

Never prepcheck an item that doesn’t read.

These rules hold good for all lists, all items, even Dianetics.

A „tick” or a „stop” is not a read. Reads are small falls or falls or long falls or long fall blowdown (of TA).

A preclear’s case can be gotten into serious trouble by listing a list that doesn’t read or prepchecking or running an item that doesn’t read.

On a list, this is the sort of thing that happens:

The List is „Who or what would fly kites?” The C/S has said to „List this to a BD F/N Item”. So the auditor does list it without checking the read at all. The list can go on 99 pages with the pc protesting, getting upset. This is called a „Dead horse list” because it gave no item. The reason it didn’t was that the list question itself didn’t read. One does an L4 on the pc to correct the situation and gets „Unnecessary action”.

On a list that is getting no item you don’t extend. You correctly use L4 or any subsequent issue of it. If you extend a „dead horse list” you just make things worse. Use an L4 and it will set it right.

This weird thing can also happen. C/S says to list „Who or what would kill buffaloes?” The auditor does, gets a BD F/N Item „A Hunter”. The C/S also says to list as a second action „Who or what would feel tough?” The auditor fails to test the Question for read and lists it. Had he tested it, the list would not have read. But the list comes up with an item, „A mean hunter”. It has stirred up charge from the first question and the item „A mean hunter” is a wrong item as it is a misworded variation of the first list’s item! Now we have an unnecessary action and a wrong item. We do an L4 and the pc is still upset as maybe only one or the other of the two errors read.
In a Dianetic "list" one is not doing a listing action. One is only trying to find a somatic or sensation, etc. that will run. The item must read well. Or it won’t produce a chain to run. In actual fact the Dn list Q does usually read but one doesn’t bother to test it.

But an item that doesn’t read will produce no chain, no basic and the pc will jump around the track trying but just jamming up his bank.

The moral of this story is:

**Always test a Listing Question before letting the pc list.**

**Always mark the read it gave (SF, F, LF, LFBD) on the worksheet.**

**Always test an item for read before prepchecking or running recall or engrams.**

**Always mark the read an item gave (SF, F, LF, LFBD) on the worksheet.**

**CHARGE**

The whole subject of "charge" is based on this. "Charge" is the electrical impulse on the case that activates the meter.

"Charge" shows not only that an area has something in it. It also shows that the pc has possible reality on it.

A pc can have a broken leg, yet it might not read on a meter. It would be charged but below the pc’s reality. So it won’t read.

**THINGS THAT DON’T READ WON’T RUN.**

The Case Supervisor always counts on the Auditor to test Questions and Items for read before running them.

The auditor, when a Question or Item doesn’t read, can and should always put in "Suppress" and "Invalidate". "On this (Question) (Item), has anything been Suppressed?" "On this (Question) (Item), has anything been Invalidated?" If either one read, the question or item will also read. The Case Supervisor also counts on the Auditor to use Suppress and Invalidate on a Question or Item. If after this there is still no read on the Question or Item, that’s it. Don’t use it, don’t list it. Go to the next action on the C/S or end off.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
Remimeo
Franchise
All Auditors
Level III Checksheets

Replaces HCO Bs 22 May 65 and 23 Apr 64,
and cancels HCO B 27 July 65 all on the same subject.

**SCIENTOLOGY III**

**AUDITING BY LISTS REVISED**

(Note: We now F/N everything. We do **not** tell the pc what the meter is doing. This changes „Auditing By Lists” in both respects. We do not say to the pc, „That’s clean” or „That reads”.)

**AUDITING BY LISTS**

(Reference: HCO B 14 Mar 71, „F/N Everything”)

Use any authorized, published **list**. (Green Form for general review, L1C for ARC Brks, L4B for listed items list errors.)

**METHOD 3**

Use meter at a sensitivity so meter needle is loose but it is easy to keep needle at „Set”. If sensitivity is too high the needle will be in constant motion as one tries to set the TA. If too low, the instant read will not be visible. 5 is usual for upper grade cases. 16 is usual for lower grade or Dianetic cases.

Have your meter in a position (line of sight) so you can see the list and the needle or you can see the needle and the pc. The meter position is important.

Hold the mimeoed list close beside the meter. Have your worksheet more to the right. Keep record on your worksheet. Mark the pc’s name and date on it. Mark what list it is on the W/S with Time. It remains in the folder stapled to the W/S.

Read the question on the list, note if it reads. Do **not** read it while looking at the pc, do **not** read it to yourself and then say it while looking at the pc. These are the L10 actions and...
are called Method 6, not Method 3. It is more important to see the pc’s cans than his face as can fiddle can fake or upset reads.

TR 1 must be good so the pc clearly hears it.

You are looking for an Instant Read that occurs at the end of the exact last syllable of the question.

If it does not read, mark the list X. If the list is being done through an F/N and the F/N just continues, mark the Question F/N.

If the question reads, do not say „That reads”. Mark the read at once (tick, SF, F, LF, LFBD, R/S), transfer the number of the Q to the W/S and look expectantly at the pc. You can repeat the Q by just saying it again if pc doesn’t begin to talk. He has probably already begun to answer as the Q was live in his bank as noted by the meter.

Take down the pc’s remarks in shortened form on the W/S. Note any TA changes on the W/S.

If the pc’s answer results in an F/N (Cog VGIs sometimes follow, GIs always accompany a real F/N), mark it rapidly on the W/S and say, „Thank you. I would like to indicate your needle is floating.”

Do not wait endlessly for the pc to say more. If you do he will go into doubt and find more, also do not chop what he is saying. Both are TR errors that are very bad.

If there is no F/N, at the first pause that looks like the pc thinks he has said it, ask for an Earlier Similar _____ whatever the question concerned. Do not change the Q. Do not fail to repeat what the Question is. „Was there an Earlier Similar Restimulation of ‘rejected affinity’?” This is the „E/S” part of it. You do not leave such a Question merely „clean”.

It does not matter now if you look at the pc when you say it or not. But you can look at the pc when you say it.

The pc will answer. If he comes to a „looks like he thinks he said it” and no F/N, you ask the same Q as above.

You ask this Q „Was there an earlier similar ______” until you finally get an F/N and GIs. You indicate the F/N.

That is the last of that particular question.

You mark „F/N” on the list and call the next question on the list. You call this and other questions without looking at the pc.

Those that do not read, you X as out.

The next question that reads, you mark it on the list, transfer the question number to the W/S.

Take the pc’s answer.
Follow the above E/S procedure as needed until you get an F/N and GIs for the question. Ack. Indicate and return to the mimeoed list.

You keep this up until you have done the whole list in this fashion.

If you got no read on the list Question but the pc volunteers some answer to an unread question, do not take it up. Just ack and carry on with your mimeoed list.

**Believe your meter.** Do not take up things that don’t read. Don’t get „hunches”. Don’t let the pc run his own case by answering non-reading items and then the auditor taking them up. Also don’t let a pc „fiddle the cans” to get a false read or to obscure a real one. (Very rare but these two actions have happened.)

**BIG WIN**

If half way down a prepared list (the last part not yet done) the pc on some question gets a wide F/N, big Cog, VGIs, the auditor is justified in calling the list complete and going to the next C/S action or ending the session.

There are two reasons for this – one, the F/N will usually just persist and can’t be read through and further action will tend to invalidate the win.

The auditor can also carry on to the end of the prepared list if he thinks there may be something else on it.

**GF AND METHOD 3**

When a GF is taken up Method 3 (item by item, one at a time and F/Ned) it can occur that the TA will go suddenly high. The pc feels he is being repaired, that the clearing up of the first item on the GF handled it and protests. It is the protest that sends the TA up.

This is not true of any other list.

Thus a GF is best done by Method 5 (once through for reads, then the reads handled).

L1C and L4B, L7 and other such lists are best done by Method 3.

The above steps and actions are exactly how you do Auditing by List today. Any earlier data contrary to this is cancelled. Only 2 points change – we F/N everything that reads by E/S or a process to handle (L3B requires processes, not E/S to get an F/N) and we never tell the pc that it read or didn’t read, thus putting his attention on the meter.

We still indicate F/Ns to the pc as a form of completion.

L1C and Method 3 are not used on high or very low TAs to get them down or up.

The purpose of these lists is to clean up by-passed charge.
An auditor also indicates when he has finished with the list.
An auditor should dummy drill this action both on a doll and bullbait.

The action is very successful when precisely done.

L. RON HUBBARD
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INSTANT READS

The correct definition of instant read is that reaction of the needle which occurs at the precise end of any major thought voiced by the auditor.

All definitions which state it is fractions of seconds after the question is asked, are cancelled.

Thus an instant read which occurs when the auditor assesses an item or calls a question is valid and would be taken up and latent reads, which occur fractions of seconds after the major thought, are ignored.

Additionally, when looking for reads while clearing commands or when the preclear is originating items, the auditor must note only those reads which occur at the exact moment the pc ends his statement of the item or command.

L. RON HUBBARD
Founder
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